3935.aaa

A REPLY TO M. NICHOLAS SMITH,

HIS

DISCVSSION,

of some pointes of

M. DOCTOVR KELLISON his Treatise of the Hierarchie.

BY A DIVINE

Facile est cuiquam videri respondisse qui tacere noluerit. Aug. l. 5. de Ciu. cap. 27.

It is easie for any man to seeme to haue answvered, that vvill not hold his peace.

PRINTET AT DOWAY.
By the Widovve of Marke Wyon. 1630.


BRITISH MUSEUM

GENTLE AND CATHOLIQVE READER.



MAISTER Doctour Kelliſon, as he hath vvritten diuers bookes tending to the Reconciliation of heretickes to the Catholique Church: ſo of late he ſette forthe a *Treatiſe* entitled: *The Hierarchie of the Church*, that thereby he might reconcile ſome Catholiques, the one to the other, to vvit the ſecular Clergie and Regulars, vvho, though both vvorthie members of the Ca-

tholique Church, ſeemed to be at ſome litle variance.

The reaſon vvhy he published this Treatiſe, vvas, as I haue heard him ſaye, becauſe he vvas informed by letters, and perceiued by certaine vvritinges and Pamphlets vvritten toe and froe, that there vvas ſome diuiſion betvvixt the moſt Reuerend Bishop and Clergie on the one ſide, and the Regulars on the other ſide, to the greate griefe, I am ſure, of both ſides, to the edification of fevv, and dishonour of all.

Wherfore partlie out of compaſſion vvhich hee tooke to ſee tvvo ſo vvorthie bodyes (vvhich beare no litle ſvvaye in our litle Church of England, and vvhich heretofore ioyned both labours and

and bloud in ſetting forth the Catholique cauſe) to be ſo deuided in opinions and affections; and partlie at the requeſt of ſome friendes, vvho vvished vvell to bothe (for ſetting theſe tvvo motiues aſide, he vvould not haue entermedled in ſo ticklish a buſines, vvherin he might offend one partie and peraduenture both, though he honoreth and loueth both, he vnder tooke the vvriting of the aforeſayd Treatiſe of the Hierarchie, and of diuers orders of the Church, that ſo he might take occaſion to vvrite of the dignitie and neceſſitie of Bishop, and ſecular Clergie, vvhich ſeemed by many clamours vvhich he heard of, and vvritings alſo vvhich he ſavve, to be oppoſed; in ſo much that Epiſcopall au-

thoritie in England, and in theſe tymes vvas counted a *noueltie*, *odious*, *contrarie to ancient lavves of England*, *and preiudiciall to ſoules*, and yet to ſpeake alſo of the ſtate and perfection, belonging to Regulars, vvho ſeemed to bee oppoſers, and ſo to diſpoſe both partyes to peace and concord.

And therfore he vvrote a long Dedicatorie Epiſtle to all the Catholiques of England, exhorting all to agree in affections as they doe in matters of fayth and Religion, and the Regulars to honour the ſeculars, and the ſeculars to imbrace the Regulars as their fellovv miſſioners, ayders and cooperatours. VVhich exhortation he oftentymes vpon occaſion repeateth in his Treatiſe, and hath not

in all the booke ſo much as one bitter or tarte vvord againſt perſon or ſtate, vnles novv and then a glaunce againſt Luther and Caluin: but ſo he extolleth the Biſhop and Clergie, as he depreſſeth not the Regulars, but giueth them as much as S. Thomas of Aquin an holy and learned regular doth yeeld vnto them. In ſo much that diuers vvere of opiniō, and he him ſelf alſo verilie hoped, that this Treatiſe vvould not haue offended any, but rather vvould haue pleaſed all, and by pleaſing all, induced all to an attonemēt Out of vvhich hope and opinion he feared not to put his name vnto his booke, nor to preſent it as a gratefull guift to the cheefe of our English Regulars in Dovvay, vvhere the booke

booke vvas printed.

But he hath vnderſtood by letters from England, and nowv lately by a certaine Diſcuſſion fathered on a Regular deceaſed (the Father belike vvas ashamed to behold his *Poſthumus*, and therfore dyed) that the Regulars tooke not this his Treatiſe in that good part he vvished and hoped; but rather thought themſelues dishonored by it: vvhich the more grieued him, becauſe as he ſincerelie proteſted in his Epiſtle Dedicatorie, and often tymes hath made the ſame proteſtation by vvord of mouth, he intended in noe vviſe to diſgrace the venerable and approoued ſtate of Regulars, but ſo to commend the ſtate of the Bishops and Clergie, vvhich he ſavv vvas ma-

mainely oppoſed, as yet to giue to the Regulars as much as the learnedſt Regulars doe yeeld vnto them, and conſequentlie ſo to right one partie, as not to vvrong the other, but rather to commend both.

Some freinds haue vrged him to make a Replye to this *Diſcuſſion* fathered on *M. Nicholas Smith:* but *M. Doctour* had not (as he ſayd) the harte to vvrite againſt a Catholique and him a Regular, counting it no grace to diſgrace a Catholique, noe victorie to ouercome him: and fearing leaſt in vvriting againſt him, he might contriſtate other Catholiques, and noe leſſe make glad our common enemyes, vvho imagine our vvarre to be their peace.

Yea *M. Doctour* vſed to ſaye: To vvhat purpoſe ſhould J anſvvere one vvho vvriteth not againſt mee. For I neuer think that he vvriteth againſt mee, vvho vvilfullie or ignorantlie miſtaketh my vvords and meaning, and putteth vpō mee vvhat I neuer ſayd or mēt, that ſo he may haue the greater aduantage and make a shovv of a victorie. But he vvriteth againſt mee (ſayd the *Doctour*) vvho vvriteth againſt my vvords and meaning: and if he fathereth on mee (as *M. Nicholas* vſeth to doe) that vvhich J neuer ſayd or ment, and in that ſorte maketh his aſſault; hee aſſaulteth not mee, but a ſuppoſed and fayned aduerſarie. And yet if *M. Nicholas*, had not fayned ſuch an aduerſarie, he could

not

not haue made ſo much as a shovv of an anſvvere to the Hierarchie, as shall euerie vvhere be shevved in the decourſe of this reply. And beſides (ſayd *M. Doctour*) I ame imployed in more important buſineſſes; and if I vvere not, yet doe I not think a Reply neceſſarie, vvhere there vvas noe anſvvere, but only vvreſting of vvords, vvittingly or vnvvittingly miſtakinge, ſcanning of intentions, impoſition of vntruthes, ſo to make a shovv of a victorie, vvhere indeed *M. Nicholas* him ſelfe vvas foyled. And moreouer he ſayd the booke vvill anſvver for it ſelfe, and the iudicious Reader (as he heareth a learned deuine in his *Inquiſition*, and ſome others haue done) vvill out of it anſvvere for him. And laſt

of all, he sayd: vvhy should I encounter vvith an aduersarie that dareth not shevv him selfe in the field, and therfore goeth masked vnder another mãs name: though it is thought he vvalketh rather in a nette; the question, vvho he should be, being not so hard to solue, as *Gordius* his *Knotte* vvas to bee dissolued.

Yet out of the respect and affection I beare to *M. Doctour*, and in regard of the obligation vvherby I ame obliged to him (as hauing liued vnder his gouernment) and out of the care I haue of his good name and reputation (vvhich I thought could not be impeached vvithout some preiudice to the common cause) I haue vndertaken to answver for him, and in this my

Reply

Reply to imitate the temper and moderation vvhich hee in his *Hierarchie* hath vſed: and not to follovv the ſplene, bitternes, immodeſtie and ſmale reſpect of *M. Nicholas*.

Many, vvho haue redde *M. Doctours* booke, haue much commended him (to my knovvledge) by letters from England and other places for his mildnes, temper and diſcretion; and therfore as many doe vvonder vvhy *M. Nicholas*, and he a Regular, should anſvvere him vvith ſuch bitternes and immodeſtie.

VVhat is there in *M. Doctours* booke vvhich ſo moueth his patience? I ame ſure there is not one taste vvord in all *M. Doctours* booke: and he vvriteth againſt noe

perſon, noe ſtate, noe order; not meddleth he vvith the late controuerſie, and for no other reaſon but becauſe he vvould not offend. It is true he vvriteth of the Hierarchie of the Church, and of all orders: but that is a point of the Catholique fayth, vvhich (as *M. Nicholas* confeſſeth in his firſt queſtion n. 2.) *Hath beene handled moſt learnedlie, copiouſly, and eloquentlie by diuers, both in latine and vulgar tongues* as indeed it hath by *S. Thomas of Aquin, Suarez*, and others in latine. VVhy then vvriteth not *M. Nicholas* againſt them, as vvell as againſt *M. Doctour*, they hauing not handled the matter vvith more temper then he, nor hauing yeelded more to regulars then hee? vvhat then is it, *M. Nicholas*,

that

that ſo moueth your Choler? *M. Doctour* exalteth the Bishop and Clergie. So doe *S. Ignatius*, *S Ambroſe*, *S. Chryſoſtome* cited by *M. Doctour* in his 7. chapter, ſo doe all that vvrite of the Hierarchie; ſo doth the Councell of Trēt, vvhich ſayth, that *Bishops doe appertaine principallie to Hierarchicall order*, ſo doth S. Thomās of Aquin alleaged by *M. Doctour* in his 11. chapter n. 18. And as *M. Doctour* exalteth the Bishop and Clergie, ſo doth he the Regulars in their ranke. But he giueth the precedence in dignitie and ſtate of perfection to the Bishop, as S. Thomas and all deuines and Fathers doe: hee shevveth the neceſſitie of Bishops in the Church of God; the need that all countries haue of Confirmation,

Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 23. c. 4.

S. Th. 2. 2. q. 185. art. 8.

tion, vvhich ordinarilie can not be had vvithout a Bishop, vvhoſe ſplendour, *M. Nicholas* peraduenture feareth vvould obſcure his ovvne.

This then may bee the cauſe (for I can fynd no other, *& hinc illæ lachrymæ.* This is the cauſe of his rough anſvver vvhich in euerie page allmoſt is ſo bitter, that as the lavves of *Draco* the Legiſlatour of the *Athenians* vvere ſayd to haue been vvritten vvith mans bloud, by reaſon of their crueltie, ſo *M. Nicholas* his *Diſcuſſiõ* may bee ſayd to haue been vvritten not vvith inke, but vvith galle, it is ſo byting and bitter.

Certes although I vvill not iudge of his ſpirit, yet he ſeemeth to shevve litle of the ſpirit of a

Re-

Religious man, vvhich is the ſpirit of humilitie, patience, modeſtie, charitie, and of reſpect to Bishops, Prelats, Prieſts, and Paſtours: ſuch as vvas the Spirit of *S. Benedict, S. Bernard, S. Dominike, S. Ignatius, S. Xauier.* For that he ſtriueth to depreſſe the ſtate of Bishops and Paſtours, and to extenuate the neceſſitie both of Bishops and of the Sacrament of Confirmation.

VVherfore I proteſt ſincerelie, and as God knovveth, from my harte, that I ame hartilie ſorrie that he hath giuen me a iuſt cauſe, and imposed a neceſſitie on me to anſvver his *Diſcuſſion*, and defend *M. Doctour* and the true doctrine deliuered by him: becauſe I feare I can not doe this ſufficientlie (as I muſt, ſeing I haue vndertaken to

anſvver for *M. Doctour*) vvithout dishonour to *M. Nicholas* a Catholique and Religious man, and in credit and eſtimation in his Order. Yet vvhat I can doe vvithout preiudice to *D. Kelliſon*, vvhoſe honour is deare vnto mee, and to the true doctrine, vvhich he hath taught, I shall doe: And therfore J meane not to imitate his odious manner of vvriting, vvhich J heare is diſpleaſing to all iudicious and indifferent Readers; rather I vvill paſſe ouer his harsh ſpeeches vvith patience, though not allvvayes vvith ſilence, and vvheras it is his vſuall manner to inſult before the victorie vvith theſe and the like ſpeeches: *A doughtie argument*, pag. 16. *J vvill not ſay noe diuine, but euen no man in his right iudgement,*

can

can affirme, pag. 48. *I cannot but meruaile that a learned man should vse such a forme of argument*, pag. 48 *still M. Doctour citeth Authours against him selfe*, pag. 89. &c. I shall not insult ouer him, though, as the Reader shall see, I get the maistrie ouer him, and the victorie of him; holding it a base thing, and not vvorthie a generous mynd, to strike his aduersarie or insult vpon him, vvhen he lyeth on the ground. But rather I vvill proceede vvith patience and charitie, and vvill content my selfe to ouercome, and to put my aduersarie to silence by argument, not by cryes and clamours: and though I be noe Regular, yet I vvill endeauour to giue him example of religious humilitie, modestie,

and charitie.

But to returne to the Reader to vvhom this preface is addreſſed, J ſhall deſire him not to be ſcandalized to ſee one Catholique vvrite againſt another: Catholiques as Catholiques agree allvvayes in matters of fayth, and good Catholiques neuer breake charitie: but the beſt Catholiques, as men, may varie in other opinions. S. Peter, S. Paule, and S. Barnabas: and S. Auguſtine, and S. Hierome, diſagreed in ſome opinions vvithout breach of fayth or charitie. About the obſeruation of Eaſter there vvas greate debate betvvixt Saintes and Saintes, till the Church decided the controuerſie, yea Angels haue diſſented in opinion. And ſo long as the diſſenſiō is not in mat-

Gal. 3. Act. 15. Hieron. Ep. 86. & ſeq. Aug. Ep. 8. & ſeq. Euſ. l. 5. c. 24. & 25. Beda l. 3. hiſt. Angl. c. 24. & 25. l. 5. c. 16. Daniel 10.

ters

ters of fayth, it may be vvithout preiudice to faith, and vvithout breach of charitie. And hovvſoeuer, this vvriting of one Catholique againſt another, is to be imputed to *M. Nicholas*, vvho vvas the firſt that vvrote againſt a Catholique; for that *M. Doctour* vvrote againſt noe mã, and I vvould neuer haue vvriten againſt *M. Nicholas*, but in defence of a Catholique, and Catholique Doctrine.

And as thou (Gentle Reader) art to be a ſpectatour of the encounter and combat betvvixt me and *M. Nicholas*; ſo I deſire thou ſhouldſt be the iudge and vmpier alſo; ſo that thou follovveſt not affection vvhich oftentymes blindeth, but vnblinded reaſon, vvhich neuer deceiueth, but vvill cauſe

cauſe thee to pronounce ſentence
vvhere thou ſeeſt moſt reaſon,
not vvhere thou ſettleſt moſt thy
affection.

6 NO 63

TO

TO THE VENERABLE CLERGIE OF ENGLAND BOTH, SECVLAR AND REGVLAR.

ALthough in this my reply vvhich I haue made for the inſt defence of M. Doctour, *and of the truth deliuered by him, I may offend ſome; for that* veritas odiũ parit, *and be it neuer ſo diſcreetlie deliuered, is diſpeaſing to ſome, yet my deſire is peace; and as the end of vvarre ought to be peace, ſo my intentiõ in this my diſputatiõ vvas to shevv euerie order the truth, vvhich all men vvhen they ſee doe imbrace; and ſo to induce them to peace.*

And therfore novv I addreſſe my ſpeache vnto you the Reuerend and venerable Prieſts of

our afflicted Church, desiring you, that seing I haue
sette before your eyes (vvhich otherwise you
knevve) the perfection of the states, both of Bis-
hops, Pastours, and Regulars: you vvould honour
Rom. 12. *one another*, yea in honour prenent one ano-
ther, *and lay a side all contentions, that* (*as the*
Philip. 2. *Apostle vvisheth*) you may be of one mea-
ning, hauing the same charitie, of one
mynde agreeuig in one: nothing by contētiō
neither by vaine glorie, but in humilitie,
eahe counting other better then them sel-
ues, euerie one not considering the thinges
that are their ovvne, but those that are other
mens.

And trulie if one order had not too greate an
ouervveening of its ovvne perfections, but rather
vvould cast an eye vpon the perfectiōs of another,
vvhich vvilbe fovvnd to excelle in one thing or
other: this consideration vvould cause humilitie,
and humilitie charitie, and charitie peace and
amitie. So our blessed saniour Christe Iesus God
and man, though euen as man he vvas greater in
dignitie and sanctitie then all the men that euer
vvere, though neuer so holy (of vvhich also he
vvas not ignorant) yet he as man considering not
so much the perfection he had by vnion vvith the
diuinitie, as vvhat he vvas according to his humā-
ne nature takē barelie and nakedlie in it selfe, and
comparing him selfe vvith the grace and sanctī-
tie he savve in others, humiliated him selfe in con-
ceite vnder others, vvho in state and dignitie

vvas

vvas aboue all others. So the Bleſsed virgine Mother, and Mother of God: ſo all the Sainctes of God, conſidering not vvhat they vvere by grace (though they knevv it full vvell) but vvhat of them ſelues they vvere, and caſting an eye of that vvhich others vvere by the diuine grace; caſt them ſelues in conceite at the feete of all men, euen thoſe that vvere farre inferiour vnto them. If all orders vvould practiſe this, none vvould contend vvith another for perfection or ſtate of perfection.

Let the Clergieman (ſayth Thomas Waldenſis) looke into the ſtate of the religions, and hee ſhall find ſomething vvherin he is inferiour to the Religious: and let the Religious man behold the order of the Clergieman and he ſhall fynd vvherin the Clergieman excelleth him. If this they doe, eahe vvill count other better then them ſelues, becauſe euerie one (as S. Paules counſelleth them) conſidereth not the thinges and perfections, that are his ovvne, but thoſe that are other mens. Th. Vvald. de Clericis & Regularibus Tit. 9. cap. 8. Philip. 2.

If this they doe, noe order vvill preferre it ſelfe before another, but rather thinck more lovvlie of it ſelfe then of another, and ſo contention vvilbe auoided: If this they doe, none vvill bragge of their ovvne ſtate and perfection, but all vvill ſtudie and endeuour to get perfection: knovving that it is not the ſtate or office, but the holy life and merit vvhich God eſpeciallie reſpecteth; and that if one liue not according to his ſtate, the higher his ſtate is, the greater is his damnation; for that

from the highest place in the lowest fall. The state of S. Paule and S. Peter is high, but as S. Hie-
Hieron Ep. ad Heliod. *rome sayth:* Non est facile stare loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri: It is not an easie thing to stand in the high place of Paule, or to hold and to stand stedfast in the high degree of Peter.

S. Augustine looking into both states, so commendeth in both the good, that he discommẽdeth in both the badde, that so if they think to well of them selues for the good, they may humble them selues in consideration of the bad: for speaking of the Bishop and the Clergie he vseth these words
Ep. 147. ad Valer. *to Valerius:* Ante omnia peto vt cogitet religiosa prudentia tua, &c. before all I desire that thy religions prudence would think that there is no thing in this life more easie, gratefull and acceptable to men, especiallie in this tyme, then the office of a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, if careleslelie it be performed, but nothing before God more miserable and damnable: likewise that nothing in this life, especiallie at this tyme, is more difficile, more laborious, more dangerous, then the office of a Bishop, Priest or Deacon, but before God nothing more happie and blessed, if so they warre as our Emperour commaundeth. *Which S. Augustine considering wept bitterlie, when he was consecrated Bishop, as he him selfe in the same epistle confesseth. And in another epistle speaking of*

Reli-

Religions, he maketh this protestation: Simpliciter autem fateor charitati vestræ coram Epist. 137.
Domino Deo nostro, &c. I confesse simplie to your charitie before our Lord God, who is witnes vpon my soule, from such tyme as I began to serue God; as I haue hardelie experienced or found better then such as haue profited in religion, so I haue not found worse then such as in monasteries haue fallen. *But as gold is not to be refused for its drosse, nor wine for the lees, nor the good corne for the chaffe; so neither are states and orders of the Church to be lesse conceited, because some mens liues are not suitable to their order and profession.*

All orders are holy, yet none so holye but that the superiour order wanteth some thing of the inferiour. The State of the Regular is inferiour to the state of the Bishop and Pastour in dignitie, and Hierarchiall functions, but it is lesse subiect to danger, and so exceedeth in securitie. The state of the Bishop and Pastour hath annexed vnto it greate honour, but this honos *is* onus, *this honour is a greater charge and burde̅, then is the Regulars state, because it is harder to saue ones selfe and others, which is the Pastours office, then to saue ones selfe only, which is the care of the Religions. Let then the Pastours behold in the Regular merit and mortificatiō: let the Regular admire in the Bishop and Pastour great dignitie, and no lesse charitie in engaging his owne life yea soule for others: and the one will not despise the*

other, but they vvill both loue and honour one another.

Greg hom. 10. super Ezech. c. 3.

S. Gregorie expounding that place, of Ezechiel: Vocem alarum animalium percutientium alteram ad alteram: the voice of the vvings of liuing creatures ſtricking one againſt another, *hath theſe vvordes*: Omnes Sancti ſe inuicem ſuis virtutibus tangunt, & ſeſe ad profectum excitant, ex conſideratione virtutis alienæ. Non vni dantur omnia, &c. The Sanctes touche one another by their vertues, and ſtirre vp them ſelues to profit by the conſideration of anothers vertues. To one all are not giuen, leaſt eleuated by pride he take a fall, but to this man is giuen vvhat to thee is not giuẽ, and to thee is giuẽ vvhich to him is denyed. That vvhileſt this man conſidereth the good that thou haſt, and he hath not, he may in his cogitation preferre thee before him ſelf: and againe vvhileſt thou ſeeſt that he hath vvhat thou haſt not, thou mayſt in cogitation ranke thy ſelfe after him, that vvhat is vvritten moy be fulfilled: Superiores ſibi inuicem arbitrantes: Eche counting others better then them ſelues. *So the ſame father a litle*

Philip. 2.

after ſayeth, but S. Paule euen after his conuerſion vvhẽ in ſanctitie and perfection he vvas peraduenture inferiour to none, yet conſidering vvhat the reſt of the Apoſtles by Chriſte his grace then vvere, and vvhat he by his ſinne and hatred of

Chri-

Christians had been, counted him selfe Apostolo- 1. Cor. 15.
rum minimum, *the least of all the Apostles, and S. Peter not regarding his owne perfection admireth S. Paules wisdome and learning* 2. Pet. 3.
shewed in his Epistles. This hath beene the practise of Christe and his Mother, as I sayd before in which all the Sanctes of God haue imitated them.

And if we practise the same mutuall consideratiõ and comparison of our defectes with others perfections, this mutuall consideration would cause mutuall loue, and mutuall loue would cause mutuall prayse, and mutuall prayse would cause mutuall humilitie (for that the more we prayse another, the lesse we esteemed our selues) and mutuall humilitie would take away all contention, (for that into humble mens consideration it neuer entreth, which is or should be greater,) and Luc. 9.
contention taken away, a peace would follow.

And indeed, now that the Regulars in England are all almost Priests, and haue the same authoritie that Priests haue; the secular Priest hath iuste cause to loue the Regular, and in him, his owne state and order: and the Regular Priest hath good reason to respect the secular Priest, Priesthood being the richest pearle of his crowne and the fayrest flower of his garland; and not to thinke that he is dispraysed when the Priest is commended.

The secular Priests who labour in the shippe of Peter vnlbe comẽ to becke to their fellowe

fisher

Luc 5. fishermen that are in another shippe, *that is in another ſtate*, to come and helpe thē. *And the Regulars vvill vvith all charitie and reſpect alſo yeeld their helping harde. The ſecular Prieſts hauing louinglie inuited them, and the chee fe Paſtour hauing ſent them to that end. And ſeing the harueſt is great, and the vvorke men fevve, the ſecular Prieſts vvill* (*as Gerſon ſayth they muſt*) benignelie and louinglie receiue them, ſo that (*ſayth Gerſon*) they doe not detract, *from the Paſtours, or ſeeke to bring them in contempt vvith their parishioners.*

Gerſ. de ſtatu Curatorum conſid. 15.

If both ſecular and Regular Prieſts vvould but looke backe to former freindlie offices vvhich haue paſſed betvvixt them, it vvould be ſufficient to make them renevv former freindſhip. The tyme hath been vvhen the Clergie of England inuited the Ieſuites to be partakers vvith thē of their merit and labours in the miſſion. Our moſt learned and zelous Cardinal of moſt pious memorie, the firſt founder of the Engliſh Seminarie, to vvit, of Dovvay, and of the miſſion of Prieſts in to England in this tyme of Schiſme, vvriteth thus in his Apologie for the Prieſts chap. 6. Cum itaque nos ante aduerteremus, & paucis ab hinc menſibus cerneremus Anglorum nonnullos a ſuperioribus Societatis Ieſu ad Indos amandatos, &c. vvhen therfore vve perceiued, and fevv monethes ſince did ſee, that ſome English men by the Superiours of the Societie of Ieſus, vvere ſent to the Indians;

Indians; vve demanded of them (*the Superiours*) that they vvho vvere of this nation, should rather be reserued for the profit of their countrie, then of externe nations: to vvhich petition after mature deliberation had of that matter, vvith great affection of charitie, they yeelded. *The like D. Worthington Presidents also of Douvay College, relateth in his Catalogue of our late English Martyrs.* Doctour Pitse also in his booke of the famous vvriters of England. In Edmundo Campiano, *Conformable to Cardinal Allen sayth:* Videntes autem sacerdotes nostri, multam esse messem, &c. Our Priests, seing that the Harnest vvas greate and Worke men fevv, did earnestlie request the Fathers of the Societie of Iesus, that they vvould adioine them selues as cooperatours, and vvould send if not earlie in the morning, at least at the third sixt or ninth hower of the day some of theirs to labour in the vineyeard of our lord. *And vvith vvhat charitie and respect the Priests receiued the first Iesuites, extolled their order, conducted them from place to place for their more safetie, and to bring them acquainted vvhere they vvere not knovvn, some yet liuing can tell; and that trulie Religious and learned Iesuite Father Campion acknovvledgeth no lesse in an Epistle to his Generall, saing:* Presbyteri nostrates, ipsi doctrina & sanctimonia præ-

ſtantes, tantam opinionem noſtri ordinis excitarunt, vt venerationem quam nobis exhibent Catholici, non niſi timidè commemorandam exiſtimẽ. Our Prieſts, they themſelues excelling in learning and ſanctitie, haue rayſed ſuch an opinion of our order, that I think the veneration which the Catholiques giue vs, is not to be ſpoken of but fearefullie. *And vvill the Ieſuites novv detract from the good name of them, vvho haue ſo much extolled their order and giuen it the firſt name and credit it had in England? noe: it can not be imagined. And vvill the Ieſuites ſeeke novv to ſupplante thoſe, vvho firſt planted them in England? noe they vvill not; and if heretofore any vvould, hereafter they vvill not. Nor vvill the ſecular Prieſts ſeeke novv to exclude Ieſuites from the miſſion, vvhom they haue louinglie inuited, knovving that:*

Turpius eijcitur quam non admittitur hoſpes:
Tis better to deny a gueſt no doubt,
Admittance; then admitted, turne him out.

Rather both orders reflecting vppon theſe former friendlie offices vvill endeauour to renevv the former friendship.

The tyme alſo vvas vvhen the ſecular Prieſts shevved courteſies to the Benedictins, and vvere ſo farre from hindering their vnion or miſſion in-

to En-

to England, that they helped to set forvvard both: and had the Clergie oppoſed their miſſion (as ſome others did) and not rather furthered thē in their ſute; vvee ſhould not haue had perchaunce, at this Day a Benedictine in England. This the Benedictins haue heretofore acknovvledged, and muſt therfore haue reſpecte to the Clergie. And if they reflect vpon the many good offices the Clergie hath done them, and if the Clergie like vviſe looke backe to the forner loue and old freindship vvhich hath been betvvixt them, it vvill I hope renevv old freindship and take a vvaye all iarres and diuiſions.

The tyme alſo vvas vvhen the Franciſcans obteyned their miſſion of Clement the eight, at the inſtance of Cardinall Allen, vvhich notvvithſtāding the Pope had before refuſed at the inſtance of Cardinall Caietan; as ſome yet aliue doe affirme, vvho liued in Rome at that tyme. And the Reuerend Father, F. Francis Nugent intending a miſſion of English Capucins, vvrote to M. Birchet then Archprieſt about the yeare 1611. to haue his conſent and aſſiſtance; to vvhich his requeſt the Archprieſt vvillinglie condeſcended. And I haue heard M. Doctour Kelliſon affirme, that he alſo vvrote to Rome to procure their miſſion.

I knovve alſo that vvhen our English Recolletes had obteyned letters of the Nuncio in Bruxelles to the Magiſtrats of Dovvay to receiue

them into their Towne; the Nuncio sent his letters inclosed in one to Doctour Kelliſon, in vvhich letters he vvrote to the ſayd Doctour, that if he thought their admiſſiõ into the Towne might prone preindiciall to his College, he should not giue them the letters, but keepe them backe: and yet Doctour Kelliſon gaue the letters to the Franciſcan that brought them, and did further their admiſſion vvhat he could. And this they also vvill acknovvledge, and this acknovvlegement vvill conſerue a reſpect in them to the Clergie and a loue of the Clergie to them.

And all theſe orders haue had their ſource and firſt beginning from the Clergie and Colledge of Dovvay: moſt of their principall men hauing had a great part, at leaſt of their education in that Colledge. And ſo the Clergie and Colledge vvill beare a fatherlie loue to their children and offspring, and the Regulars vvill neuer be vvanting in a reſpect and filiall loue to their louing Parent, and vvill neuer be ſo vnnaturall children as to oppoſe their mother that did breed and beare them: nor ſo euill byrds, as to ſeeke to ſtayne by euill aſperſions the neſt vvherin they vvere hatched.

If the Prieſts ſecular and regular be not deuided, their sheepe vvilbe vnited, and none vvill ſaye: 1. Cor. 1. Iame Paules, and I Apollos, I Cephas, but all vvilbe Chriſts, and ſeing that Chriſte is not deuided, all vvilbe vnited, and the multitude of

belee-

beleeuers vvill haue one harte and ſoule. *If* Act. 4.
the vvorkemen vvho endeuour to rebuild our Hieruſalem *and Temple, our litle Church of England, vvill vouchſafe to followv the directions of their Architect, and vvith him and the other fellovv-vvorkemen ioyne in all peace and concord their fruitefull labours: the building vvill goe on a pace, and vvill the ſooner bee finiſhed;* becauſe virtus vnita eſt fortior ſeipsâ diſperſa: vertue and force vnited is of more force then the ſelfe ſame deuided. *But if the vvorke men vvorke euerie one a parte, the vvorke vvill proceed but shovvlie; and if they oppoſe one onother, it vvill neuer be accompliſhed. Wherfore as vvee tender our ovvne ſpirituall good, vvhich vvith contention can not proſper; Catholiques edefication, vvho by this diſcord can not be edifyed; heretiques and Sckiſmatikes reconciliation vnto vs, vvho hereby vvilbe rather alienated from vs; God his honour, vvhoſe name as it vvas by Dauids ſinne* blaſphemed 2.Reg.12.
by the enemies of our lord, *ſo it vvilbe glorified by your concord and vnitie, obſcured by your diuiſion; As (I ſay) vvee reſpect al theſe things, of vvhich the leaſt should be a ſufficient motiue to reconcile vs: Let vs not ſeeke to trench vpon one another; but let vs rather as muchas reaſon and conſcience dictateth, yeeld to one another: let vs not diſpute vvho in ſtate or dignitie are greater, but rather let euerie one in humi-*

litie

litie and charitie seeke to excelle and to preuent one another: and to end as I began with S. Paule; Let nothing be done by contention, neither by vaine glorie, but in humilitie, eche one counting other better then themselues, euerie one not considering the thinges that are their owvne, but those that are other mennes.

Philip. 2.



6 NO 63

APPRO:

APPROBATIO.

VIso testimonio cuiusdã mihi probè noti, censui hunc libellum, cui titulus: *A Reply vnto Mr. Nicholas Smiths Discussion, &c.* vtiliter imprimi posse, vtpote nihil continentem quod cum fide Catholica & bonis moribus non consentiat. Duaci V. Kal. Aug. 1630.

GEORG. COLVENERIVS, S. Theol. Doctor, Regius & Primarius eiusdem in Academ. Duacena Professor, Coll. Eccl. S. Petri Præpositus, & Canon. necnon eiusdem Academ. Canc. & librorum Censor.

6 NO 63

THE FIRST QVESTION.

VVHAT IVDGEMENT, may be framed of M. Doctours Treatiſe in generall.

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

MY meaning is not to ſet downe what cenſure others euen ſecular Prieſts, to my certaine knowledge, giue of M. Doctours booke, becauſe I deſire not to giue offence &c. n. 1.

REPLIE.

1. MAISTER NICHOLAS, for an Introduction, ſaieth his meaning is not to ſet downe *what cenſure others, euen ſecular Prieſts* (but what ſecular Prieſts, if there were any, may

 eaſilie

easilie be guessed) *giue of M. Doctours booke.* And my meaning also is not to relate what I haue heard from many, euen principall men, of the impertinencie and immodestie of *M. Nicholas* his booke, and of the moderation and temper obserued by *M. Doctour* in his Treatise: and a learned Deuine in his *Inquisition* into *M. Nicolas* his *discussion* hath briefliе, yet solidlie and clearelie declared what censure his booke deserueth: and I also shall make the same more knowne to the world by this my *Reply*, then otherwise I would, could I defend *M. Doctour*, and the trueth by him deliuered, without impeaching *M. Nicholas* his honour.

2. Hee styleth his booke A MODEST BRIEFE DISCVSSION. But how immodest it is, and how little beseeming the person who wrote it, and the person against whome he wrote it, the sayed learned Authour of the *In[illegible]ion*, in his second Section, and I also in a catalogue of his tauntes, gibes, and scoffes, haue acquainted the Reader.

3. He sayeth *It may iustlie seeme strange why M. Doctour, should at this verie tyme*, write against *Caluin concerning the Hierarchie of the Church, which is an argument in these dayes not particularlie spoaken of. n.* 2. And as strange it seemeth to mee, why M. Nicholas should take vpon him to examin *M. Doctours* intentions. But what *M. Doctour* intended, and what reasons moued him to set forth that *Treatise* at this time, may easilie be gathered out of

my

my preface to the Reader. For which reasõs being resolued to write of the *Hierarchie*, hee thought he had reason to write against *Ihon Caluin* (as he doth in his second Chapter) which *M. Nicholas*, cannot take as written against him (as he seemeth to suspect n. 2.) Vnlesse he, which God forbidde, be also an enemie to the Hierarchie of God his Church.

4. But whereas, in the same place, hee meruaileth why *M. Doctour* should write of this matter, *Which had beene alreadie most learnedlie, copiouslie, and eloquentlie handled by diuers, both in Latine and vulgar languages:* I must tell him, that if he will haue no mã to write of a subiect, of which others haue written before, he must taxe almost all the writters of this present, and precedent ages, yea many of his owne order; which were much for *M. Nicholas* to doe. For what hath any man allmost written of Philosophie, Schoole diuinitie, Controuersies, Cases, Histories, which hath not beene treated of before? For, as *Ecclesiastes saieth: Nihil sub sole nouum, nec valet quisquam dicere, Ecce, hoc recens est. Iam enim præcessit in sæculis quæ fuerunt ante nos:* Nothing vnder the sunne is new: neither is any man able to say, behould this is new: for it hath alreadie gone in the ages that were before vs. Let *S. Austin* answere for *M. Doctour*: *Vtile est plures libros à pluribus fieri, diuerso stylo non diuersa fide, etiam de quæstionibus eisdem, vt ad plurimos res ipsa perueniat, ad alios sic, ad alios autem sic:* It is profitable that many bookes should be made by many, in a diuers

Eccles. cap. 1.

Aug. lib 1. de Trinit. cap. 3.

ſtyle, not a diuers faith, euen of the ſame queſtions; that the thing it ſelfe, may come to manie, to ſome ſo, to others ſo.

5. Before I goe any further I obſerue that *M. Nicholas* euen in the beginning cõtradicteth the trueth and himſelfe alſo, and that within a few lines: VVhich is an euill preſage of future lapſes, in which *M. Nicholas* will be founde tripping. For in his 2. *page n.* 3. he ſaieth *that M. Doctour is the firſt who hath put in printe a Treatiſe* (to wit of the Hierarchie) *in the Engli-h tongue.* In which words he contradicteth the trueth wittinglie (which redoubleth his fault) and himſelfe alſo. The trueth: becauſe he knoweth that before M. Doctour ſet penne to paper about this ſubiect, there was a booke of the like ſubiect published firſt in French, then in Latin, printed, as is pretended, at Herbipolis in the yeare 1626. then in English at Roan where the *Diſcuſſion* was printed: and in Latin, this booke is ſtiled *Vindiciæ priuilegiorum & gratiarum, quibus in Eccleſiaſtica Hierarchia &c.* in which booke the Authour in his *ſecond reaſon*, endeauoureth to prooue *Regulars* to be of the *Hierarchie* by the arguments, which *M. Nicholas* in his ſixt queſtion hath borrowed of him to prooue the ſame, as we ſhall ſee hereafter. And ſoe he contradicteth the trueth in ſaying that *M. Doctour* was *the firſt who hath put in printe a Treatiſe* of the Hierarchie *in the Engliſh tongue*, ſeing that the Treatiſe mentioned was printed and diuulged in England before. And in Queen Elizabethes

zabethes tyme (as *M. Nicholas* or ſome of his brethren muſt needs know) a treatiſe was ſet forth in a lay mans name to ſhew that Religious were fitter to heare Confeſſions, then Secular Prieſts.

6. He ſeemeth alſo to contradict himſelfe, for that *n.*2. he ſaieth that *diuers haue handled this argument* (before M. Doctour) *moſt learnedlie, copiouſlie, and eloquentlie both in Latin and vulgar languages* (as the alledged English booke doth) and yet he ſayeth *M. Doctour* was the firſt; and conſequentlie he ſaieth *M. Doctour* was the firſt, and not the firſt, which is a contradiction in himſelfe. VVhereby alſo it appeareth that it is farre frō trueth which he ſaieth *n.*4. that this *Treatiſe* (of M. Doctour) *hath renewed the no leſſe improfitable, then odious compariſon* betwixt the *perfection of ſecular Paſtours, and that of religious men*: for that, by his owne confeſſion, *this argument was alreader* (that is before M. Doctour wrote) *handed by diuers, both in Latin and vulgar languages*. And he is not ignorāt that *Suarez*, and *Hieronymus Platus*, mē of his owne coate haue handled this argument and compariſon more largelie then *M. Doctour* hath done, and not more moderatelie.

Suarez tom. 3. de Rel. l. 1. c. 18. Et 21. Platus de bon. ſtat. Rel. l. 1 c. 4. c. 37.

7. He calleth *M. Doctours* exhortation to peace and charitie *Verball. n.* 3. & 4. as though it came not from the harte: Which all they who knowe *M. Doctours* ſinceritie and realitie, will not thinke to be true: but rather that *M. Nicholas* taketh to much vpon him, in iudging of mens hartes: which

is a thing belonging ether to God, who is therefore ſaied to *ſearch mens hartes*, or to *the Spirit of man which is in him*: or to the Prophete or Sainct, to whom God reuealeth ſuch ſecrets.

Ierem. 17. 1. Cor. 2.

8. I agree to that he ſaieth *n.* 5. that to conſerue peace and charitie it is good *to let religious alone with their priuiledges*: So that he agree with mee that it is good alſo, that the Clergie and laytie *be let alone with their rightes*: amongſt which, one is to haue a Bishop to gouerne the Clergie, and Confirmation to ſtrengthen the laitie in a time of perſecution. But what priuiledges haue beene taken from them? Or what offer hath beene madde to deſpoile them of the ſame? They will ſay, that before a Bishop was ſent into England, Regulars were free from asking Approbation of the Bishop. But to this they are eaſilie anſwered, that exemption from asking Approbation of the Bishop to heare confeſſions of ſeculars, is not any priuiledge annexed to their order: and therefore in all Catholicke Countries, Religious men are obliged by commaundement of the Councel of Trent; and were before commanded by *Bonifacius* VIII. *Clemens V.* in the Generall Coūcel of *Vienna*, *Ioannes* XXII. and *Pius quintus*, to aske the Bishops Approbation (as they doe) to heare confeſſions of ſeculars: but it was a priuiledge graūted to ſecular Prieſts, as well as to Regulars, all the while they had no Bishop. And with good reaſon alſo: for how could they aske Approbation of a Bishop when they had no Biſhop?

Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 23 cap 15.

hop? But now ſince we haue had a Biſhop, it is a queſtion, whether they ſhould not aske approbation in England, as they doe in other Countries: which queſtion My Lord of Chalcedon, and others haue learnedlie diſputed: I will not meddle with it in this Reply, becauſe *M. Doctour* did not in his *Hierarchie.*

10. I allow alſo of that which *M. Nicholas* addeth n. 6. *that it would much anaile towards the conſeruation of charitie, if all Superiours, and Preſidents of Seminaries were effectuallie carefull that their ſubiects ſpeake of religious men with reſpect and charitie.* And as for *M. Doctour* Preſidēt of *Doway Colledge* (at whome *M. Nicholas* aymeth) I may ſay boldlie, becauſe truelie, if ſome that come from other Colledges did not ſometymes vtter their grieuances againſt ſome Regulars, there would not a word be ſpoaken againſt thē, ſcarcelie of them, in his Colledge: and I know ſome, that haue beene brought vp in other Colledges, who haue beene sharpelie reprehended by him for ſpeaking againſt ſome of them. And therefore, vnleſſe many lye that come from thence, there is more muttering againſt them in their owne Colledges them in Doway Colledge, where the greateſt part ſcarſelie thinke of thē, much leſſe ſpeake of their affaires. And if the Rectours & Superiours of other Colledges did ſeeke to inſtille into their ſubiectes a reuerence to the Biſhop and reſpect to the Clergie, many clamours and harsh ſpeaches, caſt out againſt the Biſhop and Clergie, might

haue beene ſtopped & preuẽted. But vnleſſe alſo many who come from thẽce, do tell vs, vntrueths if any in thoſe Colledges ſpeake but a worde in commendation of the Bishop and Clergie (vnder whom yet they muſt liue when they come into England) they are the worſe thought of, and farre much the worſe for it. Of this I could ſay more, but I was loath to haue ſayed thus much, had not *M. Nicholas* vrged me vnto it: To whom therefore I ſay: *Qui alterum incuſat probi, ipſum ſe intueri oportet*: he that accuſeth another of any fault, muſt looke that himſelfe be free from it, elſe in condemning another, he condemneth himſelfe.

11. And would to God the Superiours of other Colledges would teach their ſubiectes to thinke and ſpeake well of the Bishop and Clergie and other Seminaries: I know *M. Doctour* would be as forward, as the moſt forward to teach and charge his to loue and reſpect Regulars: which mutuall correſpondence if there were; a peace would not onely follow, but alſo would be conſerued; and this mutuall peace would be pleaſing to God, honorable and comfortable to both parties: but as S. Paule ſaieth: *If you bite and eate one another* (by detracting from one another) *take heed you be not conſumed of one another.* Gal. 5.

12. I wonder that *M. Nicholas num.* 7. should ſay that *M. Doctours booke* should not be pleaſing to the Sea Apoſtolike, it prouing the Catholike Romaine doctrine againſt Heretiks; commen-

ding

ding the *Hierarchie*, which the *Coūcel of Trent* defi- *Conc.*
neth to be of the diuine Institution, and to consist *Trid.*
of *Bishops*, *Priests*, *and other Ministers*: & defending *Sess 6.*
the mission of our most Reuerend Bishop sent to *& 21.*
England from the Sea Apostolik with that au- *Can. 3*
thoritie ouer England, which other Bishops haue ouer their Dioceses, and highlie cōmendeth also by the same Sea Apostolik: rather *M. Nicholas* might feare a checke, if the *Sea Apostolike* were rightlie informed, seing that he, in his *Discussion*, speaketh so coldly of the Sacrament of *Confirmation*, because he would not haue a Bishop, and so openly, that is, by a booke in printe glaunceth at the Bishops person, impugneth his mission, as not conuenient for these tymes, as though he would controlle the chiefe Pastour, and knew better then he and his Counsell, what times are most sutable for a Bishop.

Neither can *M. Doctours* booke (whatsoeuer *M. Nicholas* sayeth n. 8. be vngratefull to our English Catholiks, *much lesse to the greater and better parte.* Whome euerie where he commendeth for their zeale and constancie in defending God his cause with hazard of their liberties, landes and liues; and doth not taxe them of want of obedience or charitie (as he saieth) *in not being vnited to my Lord of Chalcedon:* for that he knoweth, that the most of them are linked to him in loue, respect, and obedience; and if some of them be not so much vnited to him as were to be wished, it is rather to be imputed to some regulars who are

their

their Guides and Directours, then to them. And how the Catholiks are not condemned of ſinne for refuſing a Bishop (as *M. Nicholas* alſo ſaieth) ſhall appeare hereafter in my reply to the third queſtiō. But whome *M. Nicholas* meaneth by the *better and greater part of Catholiks*, I know not. I had thought, when wee talke of matters of faith, the Church, and her *Hierarchie*, the greater and better parte had beene the Bishop and his Clergie together with thoſe that adhere vnto him, as to their *lawfull Paſtour*, and they as *M. Nicholas* knoweth are well pleaſed with *M. Doctours* booke, as the reſt alſo would haue beene had not *M. Nicholas*, and his, miſinformed them of the contentes.

14. Let *M. Nicholas* reflect vpon himſelfe; for if he and ſome others had not terrified them with vaine ſhaddowes and made them to feare where was no cauſe of feare, they would haue beene as zealous for a Bishop, as the moſt zealous, knowing that by the preſence of a Bishop, God would be glorified, our little Church of Englād graced, the weake Catholiks in tyme of perſecution ſtrengthned, and all comforted.

15. But I did not thinke that *M. Nicholas* could *Eædem ore frigidum efflare & calidum: Out of the ſame mouth breath could and hoate*, had I not ſeene that in diuers places of his *Diſcuſſion* he chargeth *M. Doctour* as to partialie addicted to the Bishop and Clergie; & yet in this his firſt queſtiō n. 9. accuſeth him as an enemie to his Ordinarieship. To

which

which he may eaſilie be anſwered that *M. Doctour* onely ſaieth in his 15. Chapter n.10. that the *Biſhop of Chalcedon* hath onelie a generall ſpirituall Iuriſdictiō ouer the Clergie and lay Catholiks in ſpirituall matters, and hath no Title giuen him to any particular Bishopricke in Englād, & ſo cānot chalēge to himſelfe any particular Bishoprick, no more then the Prieſts by their faculties, which they haue to preach and miniſter Sacraments all ouer England, can chalenge any particular parish Church: Which he ſayed to shew that our Proteſtant Bishops haue no iuſt occaſion to except againſt our Catholik Bishop. Yet who can doubt but that as the Pope hath giuen him that power and authoritie ouer England, which other Bishops haue ouer their Dioceſes, ſoe he can *Ex plenitudine poteſtatis, by fulneſſe of power*, with this generall authoritie, make him Ordinarie of England by an extraordinarie manner, as at firſt he was ſtiled. But whether he be *De facto* Ordinarie, or no, becauſe *M. Doctour* in his *Hierarchie* neuer determined it, nether will I. Yet I haue ſeene certaine writings, in which ſome haue learnedlie diſputed for his ordinariship: on which he ſtandeth not ſo much, as on the power of an ordinarie, which he thinketh ſufficient to demaund approbation.

16. *M. Nicholas* (as he is verie forwards in that kinde) againe chargeth *M. Doctour*, ſaying: *that it cannot be pleaſing to God to treate of holy things vpon particular deſignes:* And ſo ſtill maketh himſelfe

ſelfe iudge of *M. Doctours* intentions. But let him looke into his owne conſcience, and ſee whether he cannot there diſcouer *a particular deſigne* in oppoſing the hauing of a Bishop in our Countrie. *M. Doctour* hath proteſted before God in his Epiſtle dedicatorie, and other partes of his *Hierarchie*, that he entended onelie that the Bishop should be honoured, and all orders, in their ranke, reſpected, and I haue alreadie in my preface to the Reader layed opē his intentiō. And therefore *M. Doctour* knowing his owne good intention hopeth that he pleaſed God in writing his Hierarchie for ſo good an end, as to commend all orders in their kind, and thereby to induce them all to peace with one another.

17. Let *M. Nicholas* take heed of his Diſcuſſion full falſe dealings, wrong imputations, wilfull miſtakings, gibes, and tauntes to diſgrace M. Doctour, as in theire places shalbe shewed; farſed with many oppoſitions againſt a Bishop ſent and commended by the chiefe Vicar of Chriſt: derogating to the holy Sacrament of Confirmation (whoſe neceſſitie he ſlighteth, whoſe perfection he denyeth in denying that it maketh vs perfect Chriſtians; oppoſite to the ancient fathers, who, as I haue shewed in my Reply to the 4. queſtiō. n. 15. attribute that perfection vnto it. And for no other cauſe, but becauſe he cannot brook a Biſhop: Let him I ſay take heed leaſt his diſcuſſion fraught with this ill marchandiſe, be neither pleaſing to God, nor man.

S. Cle. Ep. 4. S. Vrbanus ep. decret.

18. As

18. As for the manner *held by M. Doctour in proouing his Tenets*, which *M. Nicholas* n. 11. auerreth not to be correſpondent *to the opinion of his learning*, but to be eaſilie anſwered, and without any ſtudie; the trueth thereof ſhall appeare in my Reply, by which I ſhall defend all *M. Doctours* poſitions, and ſhall ſhew *M. Nicholas* his anſwere to be altogether deficient or not to the purpoſe: Whereby I think in the end he will not haue the face; and, I ame ſure, not the cauſe, to bragge, as he doth.

19. I cannot here omit, how n. 12. he accuſeth M. Doctour of want of Logike and prudence, though, he hath taught Diuinitie alone longer, then *M. Nicholas* hath beene in ſtudying Logik Philoſophie and diuinitie. There are many manners of arguing, and all good in their degree, for the Logician ſometimes argueth from the cauſe to the effect, which manner of arguing is called *demõſtratio propter quid*: ſometimes he proceedeth from the effect to the cauſe, which is *demonſtratio quia*: and ſometimes he argueth from intrinſecall, ſometimes from extrinſecall cauſes: and all theſe formes of arguing are good, becauſe there is a connexion betwixt the cauſe and the effect, and ſoe one inferreth another, and the cauſe is *notior naturâ* then the effect, and the effect is *notior nobis* then the cauſe, and ſoe they may inferre one another. And it were to be meruailed if *M. Doctour* ſhould hit vpon none of theſe formes and manners.

20. But

20. But let vs heare what M. Nicholas saieth: *for example* (saieth he) *to proue the necessitie of a Bishop in England, he seruеth himselfe of these strange and vntoward propositions*: that *it is a diuine law for euery such particular Church, as England is, to haue a Bishop*: that *without a Bishop England cannot be a particular Church*: that *vnlesse euerie particular Church haue it Bishop or Bishops, the whole Church should not (as Christ hath instituted) be a Hierarchie composed of diuers particular Churches*. That *without a Bishop we cannot haue Confirmation, which whosoeuer wanteth, is not, as M. Doctour saieth, a perfect Christian*. And are these *harsh, strange and vntoward propositions*, they being grounded in Scripture and the diuine law? To speake with in compas, this saying of *M. Nicholas*, is a verie rash assertion.

21. That these propositiõs are true & according to Scripture and the diuine law, and consequẽtlie not *harsh*, I shall proue more at large in their proper places. Here I briefelie argue thus: It is of the diuine law that there must be Bishops in the Church, as *M. Doctour* hath proued in his 12. 13. & 14. chap. and as *M. Nicholas* confesseth *q.* 3. *n.* 4. & 17. and cannot denie, if he wilbe a Catholik. And why? But to supplie the wants the Church hath of Preaching, Sacraments, and in particular of Confirmation, of which onely the Bishop is ordinarie Minister: but one Bishop cannot supplie the wantes of twoe notable partes, such as are England, Spaine, and France: *Ergo* euerie notable part, such as these Countries are, must at least

haue

haue one Bishop, and that also by the deuine lawe.

Soe likewise that without a Bishop a people cannot be a particular Church I shall proue in the next question. *n.* 2. For if it be true which S. Cyprian sayeth, that the Church is *Sacerdoti plebs adunata, A people vnited to the Priest*, that is, Bishop; then that people which hath no Bishop cannot be a Church: and consequently also the whole Church cannot (as Christ hath instituted) be a Hierarchie composed of diuers particular Churches, vnles these Churches haue euerie one their Bishop. And hence it followeth also that without a Bishop, who is the Ordinarie minister of *Confirmation*, we cannot, by ordinarie course, be perfect Christians, becaus we cannot haue *Confirmation*, which maketh vs perfect Christians, as S. *Clement* and S. *Vrban* hereafter alledged doe auerre; as also other fathers, and S. *Thomas of Aquin*, and sundrie deuines, euen Iesuites, as we shall see in the 4. *question. n.* 15. These argumēts are *à priore*, and are inferred from the extrinsecall cause, to wit, God his commandement and institution, which is a cause why Bishops are necessarie in the Church. And therefore as we may argue from the ecclesiasticall law, as from an extrinsecall cause, and say; the Church hath cōmanded to fast in Lent: Therefore we must fast: So we may argue from the deuine law as from an extrinsecall cause, and say: God hath commanded that Bishops shalbe in the Church, and that

Cypr. Ep. 69. ad Flor.

sunrie

euerie particular greate Church muſt haue it Bishop, *ergo* it muſt haue him. And ſo it was harhlie and vntowardlie ſaied of *M. Nicholas* that the aboue rehearſed *propoſitions are harsh and vntoward*; they being grounded in Scripture and Fathers.

Th 3. p.q.72 art.11. ad 1.

23. And although *S. Thomas* of *Aquin* and many diuines doe affirme that by commiſſion from the Pope, a Prieſt not Bishop may confirme: yet diuers alſo hould the contrarie, as *S. Bonauenture, Durand, Adrian VI. Eſtius in 4. d. 17. Alphonſus à Caſtro, Verbo*; *Confirmatio*: and they prooue their opinion out of *Euſebius Ep.* 3. Pope *Damaſus Epiſt. 4. Innocentius III. de conſuetud. cap. quando.* Who expreſſely affirme that *Confirmation* cannot be giuen but by the Bishop, as in the primitiue Church is was giuen by the Apoſtles onely, to whome Bishops ſucceede, and not by the diſciples to whome Prieſts ſucceede.

24. Yea they want not apparent reaſon. For (ſay they) the acte of Confirming either it is appertaining to the Bishop by reaſon of his power of *Iuriſdiction*, or by reaſon of his power of *Order*. If by reaſon of his power of *Iuriſdiction*, then a Bishop elected and confirmed, but not conſecrated, might confirme. For that he hath *Epiſcopall Iuriſdiction*, which yet neuer was ſeene, yea then this might be cõmitted to a deacon, or an inferiour miniſter, for he alſo is capable of *Epiſcopall Iuriſdiction*, as when one is elected and confirmed Bishop before he be Prieſt

Prieſt or deacon. If by reaſon of the *power of Order*, then as the Pope cannot giue power to a deacon to conſecrate, becauſe that is proper to the Character and Order of a Prieſt, ſo he cannot giue power to a Prieſt to confirme, that appertaining to the Character and Order of a Bishop. If the authours of the other opinion ſay, that the Prieſts Character of it ſelfe is ſufficient to confirme, they should contradict the Fathers alledged, who ſay that to confirme, is proper to the Bishop, and cānot agree to the Prieſt not Bishop. Beſides thence it would follow that though the Prieſt in confirming might ſinne, Confirmation being reſerued to Bishops, yet as a Prieſt ſuſpended if he cōſecrate, though he ſinneth, yet conſecration is valid: ſo if a Prieſt should confirme he should ſinne, yet Confirmation would be valid, it being not aboue his character. And this opinion would anſwere to the fact of Saint Gregorie, vpō which the contrarie opiniō much relieth; that S. Gregorie onely permitted certaine Prieſts who before had preſumed it, to anoint the baptized in the forhead, but not with the vnction proper to *Confirmation*, nor with the forme of words which the Bishop vſeth. Others anſwere otherwiſe. *Greg. l. 3. ep. 9 ad Ianuarium dist 80 cap peruenit.*

25. And to the Councells of *Florence* and *Trent*, which ſay that the ordinarie Miniſter of *Confirmation*, is the Bishop, as though the extraordinarie miniſter might be the Prieſt; They anſwere that theſe two Councells define, that at leaſt the

Bishop is the Ordinarie Minister, because it was disputed whether by commission, and as an extraordinarie Minister, the Priest might confirme. And whereas the Councell of Florence sayeth that *It is read* that sometimes by the dispensation of the Sea Apostolike a simple Priest hath confirmed; they answere the Councell defineth not that this indeed hath euer beene done, but that it is read soe. Thus they.

26. But for all this, *S. Thomas* his opinion is most probable, being now especiallie most common, though not most secure. And this opinion would alledge for it, the fact of *S. Gregorie* and the twoe councells alledged. And to the Fathers it would answere, that they meane onely that the Bishop is the onely *Ordinarie Minister* of *Confirmation*, yet that the Priest may by commission from the Pope, confirme, and they would say that the Priests Character of it selfe is sufficient to confirme, so that the Pope commit this to him; not that the Pope giueth him any power of Order, for that this Priests owne Character is sufficient, so that this condition be also put, to wit, that the Pope commit him: and if he attempt to confirme without this commission he shall not validlie confirme; because he wanteth a condition necessarie. But although this be a probable, & peraduenture the more probable opinion, as being the more common, yet the first opinion is houlden of all as vndoubted, and so is most secure.

27. And

27. And ſo we haue more reaſon to demande a Bishop then a Prieſt committed by the Pope, for that it is moſt certaine that he can confirme, and by Confirmation giue vs ſtrength againſt perſecution, and make vs perfect Chriſtians. And therefore *M. Doctour* vſeth to ſay that without a Bishop, we cannot be a particular Church, nor haue Confirmation, becauſe the Bishop is the Ordinarie and moſt aſſured Miniſter: and therefore this hereafter I will ſuppoſe.

28. *M. Nicholas n.* 13. affirmeth that *M. Doctour doth not aright cõpare Religious with Secular Prieſts.* But to this he is fullie anſwered in the *ſixt queſtion, n.* 1. Where he is tould that if we take the Regular as Regular, according to that ſtate and qualitie onely, he is not, as ſoe taken, of the *Hierarchie*, though as Regular he be aboue the laitie, and an eminent member of the Church: but the Secular Prieſt, as a Secular Prieſt, conſidered in that ſtate of a Prieſt, is of the *Hierarchie*. But more of this in that place ſhalbe ſaied.

29. *M. Nicholas numer.* 14. ſaieth *the thing which I moſt wonder in a man of learning, is, that thoſe Fathers and Schooles diuines, which he produceth, for witneſſes of his doctrine, are in deed againſt himſelfe, as the Reader will ſee in his allegation of S. Cyprian, S. Clement, Sotus, Bannes &c.* And I admire *M. Nicholas*, for many things; as for his conning carriage of things, wilfull miſtakings, falſe impoſitions &c. But moſt of all I wonder at his audacitie, and that he hath the face to vtter the aforeſaied

ſaied words ſo confidentlie. Noe doubt the Reader cannot but thinke (he affirming it ſo boldely) that *M. Doctour* hath not alledged well theſe Fathers, and Doctours; but let him ſuſpend his Iudgement vntill he come to the 2. *queſtion in M. Nicholas n.* 2. 9. 10. 11. 17. Where he ſhall finde it ſo cleare and plaine that thoſe Fathers and Doctours are for *M. Doctour*, and againſt *M. Nicholas*, that when he hath read the places alledged, he will haue cauſe neuer to credit *M. Nicholas* in this kinde vpon his word, albeit he make neuer ſo great or ſolemne proteſtations.

30. Laſtlie *M. Nicholas n.* 15. accuſeth againe *M. Doctour* for derogating to my Lord of *Chalcedons* Ordinariship: but to this he is alreadie anſwered and may haue a fuller anſwere hereafter.

31. Thus in a curſorie manner I haue runne ouer *M. Nicholas* his firſt queſtion, not ſtaying any long time about it; partely becauſe the matter by him propoſed did not require any longer diſcourſe; partely becauſe in his firſt queſtion he ſeemeth principally to bragge onely what he will doe, as in his ſeuenth and laſt queſtiō he boaſteth of what he hath done. But I hauing in the fiue middle queſtions anſwered him fullie to all; and hauing ſhewed that he hath not beene able to diſproue any one of *M. Doctours* aſſertions, nor to anſwere to any one of his arguments; it will plainelie appeare that in his firſt queſtion he breaketh promiſe, and in his laſt boaſteth of more then he hath performed.

THE

THE SECOND QVESTION.

VVhether without a Bishop there can be a particular Church.

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

MAISTER *Doctour in diuers partes of his Treatise doth teach, that without a Bishop, there can be no particular Church: And in his 14. Chapter where he endeauoureth to proue that a particular Countrie may not refuse a Bishop by reason of persecution, one of his maine arguments is* n.9. *because without a Bishop, there can be no particular Church.* n.1.

REPLIE.

M. Nicholas Smith mistaketh M. D. Kellisons *arguments.*

1. TRVE it is that *M. Doctour Kellison* in diuers places, of his Treatise doth teach, that without a Bishop there can be no particular

Church: But as concerning that which *M. Nicholas* addeth, that *one of his maine arguments chap. 14. numer. 9. is, because without a Bishop there cannot be a particular Church:* I denie that this is one of *M. Doctours* maine arguments to proue that a particular Countrie may not refuse a Bishop by reason of persecution. For that in that *14. Chapter. numer. 4. M. Doctour*, hauing affirmed that as England cannot except against the comming in of Priestes by reason of persecution, so England cannot except against the comming in of a Bishop for feare of persecution: He addeth: *And my reasons are twoe. The first is that, which I haue often alledged, because the gouernement of Bishops is instituted by Christ, and hath beene in practise in the greatest persecution, as wee haue seene in the former Chapter. My second reason is, because the commoditie which a prouince reapeth by a Bishop is so greate, and the want of him, is such a losse, that wee should rather hazard persecution (as the Africã Catholiks did) thẽ to be depriued of a Bishop.* And in this his secõd maine reason he includeth 1. the necessitie of a Bishop to make a perfect Christian: 2. the vtilitie or necessitie of Confirmation. 3. that without a Bishop there can be no particular Church. 4. that by Ordinarie course without a Bishop there can be no Hierarchicall functions. So that these twoe onely be *M. Doctours* maine arguments; and that which he alledgeth *chap. 14. n. 9.* is not, as *M. Nicholas* saieth, but onely parte of his second maine argument. For if it had beene by it selfe one of his

his maine arguments, he would not haue sayed: n. 4. *And my reasons are twoe*, but he should haue saied: And my reasons are fiue; because the seconde reason includeth fowre, which yet do all but make vp one his second maine reason.

2. Yet is that reason which *M. Nicholas* alledgeth, a good reason also, because it being the diuine lawe, that euerie particular Church of extent (for he speaketh not of euerie Dioceſe) should haue its Bishop by whome it may be made a particular Church; the people that would resist a Bishop sent in by Lawfull and Supreme authoritie (as our twoe last most Reuerend Bishops were) should resist the diuine Law and Institution, and so commit a sinne. But of this more hereafter.

M. NICHOLAS.

This assertion, he proueth out of S. Cyprian, who sayeth, that the Church is: Sacerdoti plebs adunata, & pastori suo grex adhærens: the Church is the people vnited to the Priest (Bishop) *and the flocke adhering vnto its Pastour &c.* And num. 3. *Three things I will endeauour* (saieth he) *to performe. First that the alledged words of S. Cyprian &c. Make nothing against vs, but rather are for vs, against himselfe &c.* n. 2. & 3. Ep 69. ad Flor.

THE REPLY.

M. Doctour proueth sufficientlie, and euidentlie out of S. Cyprian that without a particular Bishop, there can be no particular Church,

3 True alſo it is that *M. Doctour* alledged thoſe words out of *S. Cyprian* to proue that a particular Church cannot be without a particular Bishop. And what bringeth *M. Nicholas* to diſproue this? He anſwereth *num.* 4. that *S. Cyprian doth not define the Church to be the people vnited and the flocke adhering to a particular Prieſt and Paſtour, but onelie indefinitlie, to the Prieſt and Paſtour*: and he addeth *n.* 5. and 6. *that Saint Cyprian ſpeaketh of thoſe who by Schiſme doe leaue their Bishop.*

4. But firſt, in that *M. Nicholas* denyeth that out of this definition of a Church, it neceſſarilie followeth that a particular Church, cannot be without a particular Bishop; he contradicteth Cardinall *Bellarmin* who *lib. 3. de Eccleſ militante cap.* 5. alledgeth this definition of *S. Cyprian* word by word, and *lib.* 4. *de notis Eccleſiæ. cap.* 8. he proueth that the Church by no meanes can be without Bishops, becauſe *S. Cypian* ſayeth, *Eccleſiam eſſe Epiſcopo adunatam, & Epiſcopum eſſe in Eccleſia, & Eccleſiam in Epiſcopo: that the Church is vnited to the Bishop, and that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop.* Where firſt by the word *Sacerdoti, Prieſt*, he vnderſtandeth a particular Bishop, *not a Prieſt or Paſtour indefinitelie*, as *M. Nicholas* ſaied: becauſe in that place he proueth that the Church cannot be without particular Bishops. Secõdelie, he proueth out of this place, that the Church cannot be without Bishops, in the plurall number. And why? But becauſe particular Churches muſt haue particular Bishops. For, the

whole

whole Church cã haue but one Supreme Bishop, her gouernement being Monarchicall, which requireth one Supreme Gouernour, as *M. Doctour* hath shewed in his *Hierarchie cap.* 3. And therefore if it be neceſſarie that in the Church there should be other Bishops, beſides one Supreme Bishop, the reaſon muſt be, becauſe the notable partes of the Church, which are of notable extẽt, muſt haue their particular Bishops, by whome they may be made particular Churches, and ſo may compoſe the whole Church, and obey their particular Bishops with a ſubordination to the chiefe Bishop. Hence it is that the ſame Cardinall in the foreſaied place, alledgeth *S. Hierom l. contra Luciferianos*, who ſaieth: *Eccleſia non eſt quæ non habet Sacerdotes : the Church is not*, (or it is not a Church) *which hath not Prieſts*, that is, Bishops. And in his ſecond Tome *lib. vnico de Sacramento Confirm. cap.* 12. §. *Sextum augmentum*, he ſaieth out of S. Hierome *contra Luciferianos*; *Neceſſe eſt in ſingulis Eccleſijs vnum eſſe Epiſcopum, ne ſi multi ſint pares, & non ad vnum ſumma referatur, ſchiſmata fiant : it is neceſſarie that in euerie Church there be one Bishop, leaſt if many were equall, and the chiefe place or authoritie not giuen to one, Schiſmes should be.* And dareth *M. Nicholas* gaine ſay ſo learned a Cardinal, and him alſo a Ieſuite?

5. To *Cardinal Bellarmin* I shall adde our learned Countrieman *Doctour Stapleton*, whoin his fift booke *De poteſtatis Eccleſiaſticæ ſubiecto cap.* 7. ſaieth: *non niſi propter Paſtores & præpoſitos, Eccleſiæ nomine*

nomine vocari debet aliqua multitudo. Vnde Cyprianus, Ecclesiam esse in Episcopo; & Sanctus Hieronymus; vbi non sunt Sacerdotes, Ecclesiam non esse sapienter scripserunt: a multitude ought not to be called by the name of a Church, but onely for the Pastours and Prelats. Whereupõ, it is truelie and wiselie written by S. Cyprian, that the Church is in the Bishop; and by S. Hierome, that there is noe Church where there are noe Priests. And againe *Stapleton* saieth, *that the word*, Church, *in Scripture signifieth properlie, and, as it were, antonomasticallie, multitudinem non vagam aut ἀκέφαλον: not a vagrant or head lesse multitude: sed eui ium Pastores & præpositi à Deo constituti sunt: But a multitude, to which Pastours and Prelates are constituted by God.*

6. Soe that *Cardinall Bellarmin* and *Stapleton* (and so do all deuines) require in the whole Church many particular Churches, and to particular Churches, particular Bishops: and *M. Nicholas*, in endeauouring to extenuate *S. Cyprians* definition of a Church, depriueth Catholike Authors of a principall authoritie, by which they proue against heretikes that the Church cannot be without Bishops, and thereby he fauoureth heretikes.

7. Out of this definition of a Church giuen by *S. Cyprian*, to wit, that *it is the people vnited to the Bishop*, *M. Doctour* inferreth, that a people without a Bishop can be no particular Church. *M. Nicholas q. 2. n. 5. & 6.* saieth *S. Cyprian* speaketh of those who by Schisme do leaue their Bishop, and

so are

so are no Church. But this litle auaileth *M. Nicholas*: for that it is a *Maxime* in Logike grounded in one of the *principall places or seates of argumentes*, called *definitio, definition:* That, *Cuicunque non conuenit definitio, non conuenit definitum: to what thing soeuer the definition agreeth not, to that thing, the thing defined doth not agree*: and so seing that the definition of a Church according to *S. Cyprian*, is *Sacerdoti plebs adunata, a people vnited to the Bishop*; which definition *Stapleton* in his sixt booke *De potestatis Eccles. subiecto, cap. 7.* commendeth for a good definition saying; *Quemadmodum Ecclesiam bene definit Cyprianus, as Cyprian well defineth the Church to be a people vnited to its Priest (Bishop:)* to what company or multitude soeuer that definition of a Church agreeth not, that multitude can not be a Church. Now a multitude may be without a Bishop, ether because by Schisme it cutteth it selfe disobedientlie from its Bishop, or because without its fault, it wanteth a Bishop: and which way soeuer it want a Bishop, it is no Church; because which way soeuer it want a Bishop, it is not a people vnited to its Bishop: Euen as a bodie is not a perfect bodie without a head; whether it be depriued of its head, by a iust, or by an vniust sentẽce, or whether it neuer had a head. Wherefore as *S. Cyprian* out of the a foresaied definition of a Church (which *Stapleton* commendeth for a good definition) inferred that the *Nouatians* were no Church, because they had separated themselues by Schisme from their Bishop; so *M. Doctour* might

Stapl. l. 6. de potest. Eccles. Subiecto. c. 7.

might well also inferre that what countrie or people soeuer hath not a Bishop, it is not a Church; because, as *M. Nicholas is taught in Logike, Cui non conuenit definitio, non conuenit definitum*: to whome the definition agreeth not, *the thing defined agreeth not.* This onely is the difference; that they who separate themselues by Schisme frome the Bishop are not onely no particular Church for want of a Bishop, but also are no members of the whole and vniuersall Church, by reason of their Schisme, which cutteth them off from the whole Church, as *Bellarmin* proueth in the place alledged: But they who without Schisme, or heresie want a Bishop, though they be no particular Church by *S. Cyprians* definition, yet they are members of the whole Church.

Bellar. lib. 3 de Eccles. milit. c 5.

8. And so the Catholikes of England, who many yeares without their fault wanted a Bishop, were indeed no particular Church; yet they were most worthie members, of the whole Church: and the heretikes, of England, who by Schisme and heresie, separated themselues from all particular lawfull Bishops, yea from the vniuersall Bishop himselfe, were not onely no particular Church, but also were no members of the whole and vniuersall Church, being cutte of from it by schisme and heresie.

9. But *M. Nicholas* cryeth out, that *S. Cyprian* out of that definition inferreth onely that the *Nouatians*, who had cutte themselues of by schisme were no Church. It is true: and what

then?

then? May not out of the negation of the definition diuers concluſions be inferred, and cõſequentlie, that they alſo who without ſchiſme want a Bishop be no Church? Elſe if *M. Nicholas* inferreth that a horſe is not a man becauſe to a horſe agreeth not the definition of a man, which is; *Animal rationale*; *M. Doctour* muſt not inferre that a mule is not a man!, though the definition of a man agree not to it. And therefore this Maxime; *Cui non conuenit definitio, non conuenit definitum*; to whome the definition agreeth not, to it the thing defined agreeth not, as it is anvniuerſall propoſitiõ, ſo it is vniuerſallie true: and ſeing that the definition of a Church is a people vnited to a Bishop, that people which wãteth a Bishop whether by Schiſme, or otherwiſe, can be no Church becauſe it cannot be a people vnited to a Bishop, vnleſſe it haue a Bishop. And ſo all the while English Catholikes wanted a Bishop, they were no particular Church, becauſe all that while they could not be a people vnited to the Bishop.

10. *M. Doctours* grounde being ſo fullie proued to wit, that a people, cannot be a particular Church without a particular Bishop, his concluſion followeth in good conſequence, to wit, that Englãd, euen as Catholike, all the while it wanted a Bishop, was not a particular Church; and *M. Nicholas* his foundation, which was, that a people Catholike is a Church though it haue no Biſhop, being shaken and refuted, all which *M. Nicholas* buildeth thereon falleth of it ſelfe, *Nemine impellente*,

11. As

11. As for example that which he saieth *pag.* 13. n. 4. that *S. Cyprian* speaketh of a Preist indefinitelie, whe he saieth the Church is a people vnited to the Priest, and that therefore England, so long as it is vnited by obedience to the Bishop of Rome, is a particular Church without a particular Bishop; is reiected by that which is already saied and proued. For as a Church in generall is a Church, in that it is vnited to a Bishop, so a particular Church is that, which is vnited to a particular Bishop. To be vnited to the vniuersall and Supreme Bishop, is sufficient to be a member of the Church; but to be a particluar Church, is required also, that the multitude haue a particular Bishop: else euerie Catholike familie, euerie Nunnerie, yea and companie of Catholike weomen should be a particular Church, because they are subordinate to the Supreme Bishop.

12. And I wonder *M. Nicholas* cannot see this. For that as more is required to be a particular body of the Kingdome, then to be a member, so more is requisite to a particular Church, then to a member of the Church. For as if the King should take frō a dutchie the honour of a dutchie, by depriuing it for euer of a duke, that parte of his Kingdome should still be a member of the kingdome, and subiect to the King, but it should be no more a dutchie: So if the Pope should depriue some one little prouince of its Bishop (as he may) though that Prouince be ner-

neither schismaticall, nor hereticall) that Prouince should cease to be a particular Church or Dioceſe, but yet should still remaine a member of the vniuersall Church.

13. Soe likewise that which *M. Nicholas* saieth *pag.16 num.6.* falleth: because *S. Cyprian* in the Epistle alledged, by this definition of a Church, Which is; *The people vnited to the Bishop*, excludeth the Nouatians, not onely frō being a Church, but also from being of the Church, in that by Schisme they had separated themselues from their Bishop. But *M. Nicholas* demaundeth: *And what is all this to proue that a particular Church can be no such without a Bishop? no more thē if one should say: King Henrie the 8. and his adherents in Schisme, deuiding themselues from their lawfull Pastours, were no true Church: Ergo English Catholikes liuing in perfect obedience to the Vicar of Christ, cannot truelie be a Church: Which is in effect, as doughtie an argument as this: The soule, and body separated can make no true man: Ergo, if they be conioyned they cannot make a true man.* Behould *M. Nicholas* his little subtilitie, who could not distinguish betwixt Schismaticall separation, and faulteleſſe or meerelie negatiue separation. The Catholiks of England, in King Henrie the 8. his tyme, who remained in harte and profession subiect to the Bishop of Rome, were onely negatiuely separated from their particular Bishops, because King Henrie, tooke them from them by vrging them to follow him in his Schisme. And so those Catholiks

tholiks not ioyned in that Schiſme with their Schiſmaticall Bishops or King, were ſtill members of the Catholik Church by their ſubordination and obedience to it, and its vniuerſall Biſhop; but they were not a particular Church, becauſe they wanted a particular Bishop. But the Schiſmatiks who left their lawfull Bishops and the chiefe Bishop alſo, or ioyned with their ſchiſmaticall Bishops, were not onelie no particular Church for want of a lawfull particular Bishop, but alſo were no more members of the Catholik Church, by reaſon of their Schiſme.

14. And ſo his example of the ſoule and body is not to the purpoſe, or is nothing againſt that I haue ſayed. For that as the ſoule vnited to the body maketh a man, and ſeparated from it, maketh no man: ſo the people vnited to the particular Bishop maketh a particular Church; and if it be not vnited to him, maketh no particular Church, becauſe it is not a people vnited to the particular Bishop; yet it may be a member of the whole and vniuerſall Church, if it be vnited to the reſt of the Catholik Church and her chiefe paſtour. Whereas they who are ſeparated from their Bishop by ſchiſme, are not onelie no particular Church, as being not vnited to their Biſhop, but alſo are no members of the Church becauſe they are ſeparated by Schiſme: So they who are ſeparated onelie negatiuelie, are no particular Church, becauſe they haue no Bishop, yet are members of the whole Church, becauſe they are

not

not ſeparated by Schiſme.

15. And *M. Nicholas* may learne by that which I ſaied before (if he knew it not before) that it is not all one to be a particular Church or body, and and to be a member of the Church: and that euerie particular Church, is a member of the whole Church; but not euerie member of the Church, is a particular Church; becauſe *M. Nicholas* alone is a member of the Church, but no particular Church; and euery Catholike familie is a member of the Church, but not a particular Church; as euerie ſubiect & euerie towne or village is a mēber of the Empire, which contayneth many particular Kingdomes, yet is it not a particular Kingdome; for that a particular Kingdome requireth not onely to be ſubiect to the Emperour, but alſo to haue a particular King vnder the Emperour. And therefore if the Emperour would for euer depriue a countrie of the dignitie of a Kingdome, by decreeing that it should neuer haue a King againe, it should ceaſe to be a Kingdome, but should ſtill remaine a member ſubiect to the Emperour, in qualitie of a parte and member of the Empire, but not in qualitie of a particular Kingdome. And I wonder *M. Nicholas* doth not ſee this, as it ſeemeth he doth not, in that he ſo often inculcateth it, and ſeemeth to thinke it moſt certaine, that the Catholikes in England remaining ſtill good Catholikes, not ſeparated by Schiſme, muſt needs haue beene a particular Church all the while they had no Bishop.

16. In like manner that argument which he frameth against *M. Doctour num. 6.* out of *S. Cyprians* definition of a Church, is grouded in *M. Nicholas* his errour so often refuted, by which he thinketh it is all one not to be cutte of from the Bishop by Schisme, and to be a particular Church; whereas how soeuer a people wanteth a particular Bishop, whether by Schisme, or not schisme, it can be no particular Church, because it cannot be a people vnited to its Bishop, when it hath no Bishop. Yet let vs heare his argument. Thus then he argueth: *Whosoeuer are not in Schisme with any lawfull Bishop, doe fulfill the definition of a Church giuen by S. Cyprian: but those who haue no Bishop, are not in Schisme with any lawfull Bishop;* Ergo *those who haue no Bishop, do fulfill the definition of a Church giuen by S. Cyprian.* But *M. Doctour* I am sure would deny the first and *Maior* proposition of this *M. Nicholas* his Syllogisme; for that the definition of a Church giuen by S. *Cyprian* is, *Plebs Sacerdoti* (Episcopo) *adunata & Pastori suo grex adhærens: a people vnited to the Priest* (Bishop) *and the flocke adhering to its Pastour*: Which definition is not fulfilled by those, who though free from Schisme, haue no particular Bishop, because they also are not a people adhering to their particular Bishop, they hauing none at all, and so are no Church. And if I should retorte the like argument on *M Nicholas*, he would peraduenture see his errour, and the weakenesse of his owne argument. For I could argue in the like manner; *whosoeuer*

soeuer are not in Schisme with any lawfull Bishop, do fulfill the definition of a Church giuen by S. Cyprian: But a Catholike familie consisting of the good man of the howse, his wife, children, and seruantes, and considered by it selfe without a Bishop, is not in Schisme with any lawfull Bishop: Ergo *such a familie considered by it selfe without a Bishop doth fulfill the definition of a Church giuen by S. Cyprian, and consequentlie is a Church.* Which yet *M. Nicholas* cannot graunt; for although that Catholike familie be a member of the whole, yet taken by it selfe, it is not a particular Church, as aboue is demonstrated, and by examples declared.

MAISTER NICHOLAS SMITH.

That his (M. Doctour Kellisons) *application of S. Cyprians definition is iniurious to English Catholikes.* n. 7.

THE REPLY.

M. Doctour Kellison *is vniustlie calumniated as iniurious to English Catholikes, for applying vnto them S. Cyprians definition.*

17. It will proue that *M. Nicholas* is iniurious to *M. Doctour*, but not *M. Doctour* to English Catholikes, when the matter shalbe examined. For, as we haue seene aboue, *S. Cyprian* out of the definition of a Church; *Sacerdoti plebs adunata, a people vnited to its Priest* (Bishop) inferreth that the *Nouatians* were not onely no Church, because they had no Bishop, hauing left him; but also were not of the Church, because they had separated themselues by schisme from

Bishop and Church also. And so (saieth hee) *If any be not with the Bishop* (to wit by reason of Schisme) *hee is not in the Church, and they do in vaine flatter themselues, who hauing not peace with the Priests of God, creepe in, and beleiue that secretlie they are in communion with some &c.*

Cypr. ep. 69.

18. But *M. Doctour* goeth not so farre, nor did he euer affirme, or thinke that the English Catholikes were not of the Catholike Church, but in his *Hierarchie* diuers times calleth them most worthie members of the Church, and a mirrour to all other Catholikes, for their zeale towards God his cause, and their constance in Religion. Onely he inferred out of the definition of a Church giuen by *S. Cyprian*, that they were not, all the time they had no Bishop, a particular Church, but yet were a worthie member of the whole Church. And so *M. Nicholas* wrongeth *M. Doctour* in saying, that in his application of *S. Cyprians* definition, he is *Iniurious to English Catholikes*, as though *M. Doctour* had inferred out of that definitiõ, that the English Catholikes, all the while they wãted a Bishop, were schismatikes, & out of the Church, as the *Nouatians* to whome *S. Cyprian* applieth his definition, were; Which is no lesse then a false calumniation. For although out of that definition of a Church, *S. Cyprian* inferred that the *Nouatians* were not onely no Church, for wãt of a Bishop, but also Schismatikes, out of the Church, because they were separated from the Bishop by Schisme; which not onely hindereth

dereth from being a particular Church, but alſo ſeparateth and cutteth of frō the whole Church. Yet *M. Doctour* inferred not that odious concluſion againſt the English Catholikes; as *M. Nicholas* ſeemeth to ſay, and therefore ſayeth that *M. Doctours application is iniurious to English Catholikes*: and giueth the reaſon, Becauſe *S. Cyprian* ſaied the *Nouatians are out of the Church: they haue no peace with the Prieſts of God &c.* but he onely inferred out of the ſame definition (as I haue tould him aboue, that out of the *ſame place or ſeate of arguments*, as definition is, many concluſions may be deduced) that the English Catholikes, all the while they had no Bishop, were no particular Church, becauſe then the definition, of a Church, which is, *A people vnited to its Bishop*, did not agree to English Catholikes: for how could they be a people vnited to their proper Bishop, who had none at all? And ſo *M. Doctour* is not iniurious to Catholikes, who pleadeth for a Bishop for thē, to make thē a particular Church and to haue other honours and commodities by a Bishop; but *M. Nicholas* is iniurious to them, who labours to hinder them frō a Bishop, by whome they should be a particular Church (as formerlie they haue beene) and that ſo glorious, that after the Church of Rome they might contend with the moſt glorious Churches of Europe.

M. NICHOLAS SMITH.

The ſecond point which I vndertooke to make good, namely, that England may be a particular Church

without a Bishop, is easilie proued &c. pagin. 201. num. 8.

The Reply.

England was not a particular Church without a Bishop.

19. It is easilie sayed *M. Nicholas*: but not so easilie proued, as partelie may appeare by that which is alreadie sayed: and *S. Cyprians* definition will still be a blocke in your way, at which you will infalliblie stumble and perchance breake your shinnes.

20. But how prooueth he that the Catholikes of England may be a Church without a Bishop? Becausе (saieth hee) *the Pope in defect of particular Bishops, is the particular Bishop, Ordinarie, and Dioceſan of ſuch Churches; as Philoſophers do teach, that almightie God the ſupreme and vniuerſall cauſe of all effects, concurreth not onelie as an immediate, but alſo as a particular cauſe to the producing of effects, when ſecond particular cauſes doe faile.* Thus he.

21. And if he meane that the Pope hath beene a particular Bishop to England, he muſt shewe it, elſe *M. Doctour* may still say, that all the while England was without a particular Bishop, it was no particular Church; or if he thinke he may argue *à poſſibili ad eſſe*, from possibilitie to actuall being, as if becauſe the Pope can be Englands proper Bishop, therefore he hath beene ſo; then euerie one should be what he may be; and ſo *M. Nicholas* should be generall of his order, becauſe he may be, and he should be a man of foureſcore

yeares

yeares of age, becauſe he may be; and he ſhould now be at Rome againe, becauſe he may be. If he meane that the Pope ſo ſoone as a countrie or Dioceſe wanteth a Biſhop, is actuallie that countries or Prouinces particular Biſhop, no Biſhoprike ſhould be vacant; becauſe ſo ſoone as the particular Biſhop is dead, the Pope is the particular Biſhop. And ſo when a Rectour of a Colledge is dead, the Prouinciall ſhould be Rectour, and when the Prouinciall is deceaſed, the Generall ſhould be Prouinciall, and no office ſhould euer be vacant; becauſe the Superiour officer ſhould ſupply it; which is abſurd: and yet be it neuer ſo abſurde, it ſeemeth *M. Nicholas* his opiniõ. For he ſaieth; *that the Pope in defect of a particular Biſhop, is the particular Biſhop, ordinarie and Dioceſan of ſuch Churches*, to wit, which want a particular Biſhop. Which is a ſtrange opinion of *M. Nicholas* his owne inuention. And by this his doctrine it would follow, that if *per impoſſibile* there were neuer a particular Biſhop, in all the Church but the Pope, the Church ſhould ſtill be Hierarchicall, compoſed of diuers particular Churches, becauſe the Pope ſhould be in that caſe not onelie an vniuerſall Biſhop of all the Church, but alſo a particular Biſhop of euerie particular Church, and ſo one ſole Biſhop (the Pope) ſhould make a Hierarchie, which conſiſteth of diuers particular Churches.

22. Yet I will not denie, but that the Pope to honour a Biſhoprick which before his Pope-

dome he enioyed, may retaine ſtill the Title of that Bishopricke, as Leo IX. did the Title of the Bishopricke of Tulle. Yea he may though vniuerſall Bishop of the vniuerſall Church, be alſo the particular Bishop of a particular Church, as he is *de facto* particular Bishop of S. Ihon Lateran: but then he muſt ether do the office there of a Bishop by himſelfe, or by his delegate; or at leaſt he muſt take vnto himſelfe the Title of that Church, not onelie in name, but in verie deed; elſe he shall not be a particular Bishop. I ſay, *or at leaſt he muſt take vnto himſelfe he Title*; for that ſeemeth to be ſufficient to make a particular Bishop, as we may gather by diuers examples: for that there is a Patriarch of Hieruſalem in Rome, who neither doth the office there by himſelfe, or anie delegate, becauſe he cannot be permitted; and *my Lord of Chalcedon*, though he do the office of a Bishop onely in England, and not at Chalcedon, ether by himſelfe, or his delegate becauſe it will not be permitted him to do ſo; Yet he is truelie the particular Bishop of Chalcedon, becauſe he hath the Title and right to gouerne that Church graunted vnto him.

Ex Baron. anno. 1849. Leon Papa 9 anno 1.

23. Now therefore if *M. Nicholas* can shew me that the Pope hath done the office of a Bishop in England by himſelfe or his delegate, or that he hath taken to himſelfe the Title of the Bishop of England, I shall graunte that all this while wee had no particular Bishop in Englād, he hath beene our particular Bishop: If he cannot,

as all

as all the world knoweth he cannot: for neither hath the Pope beene in England in person, nor hath he sent before these twoe most Reuerend Bishops anie Bishop into England to do there the offices of a Bishop, which is to confirme and ordaine; nor hath he euer takē vnto him the Title of the Bishop of England: then *M. Doctours* assertion is true, to wit, that all the while England had no particular Bishop, it was no particular Church, because, as *S. Cyprian* sayeth, the Church is *a people vnited to the Bishop*, which England could not be, when it had no Bishop. It is true the Pope is Bishop of the whole Church, and so of England, as it was a member of the whole: but he hauing neuer done there the office of a Bishop by himselfe or his delegate, nor euer taking vnto him the Title of the Bishop of England, he was not Englands particular Bishop, and so England by him could be no particular Church.

24. To *M. Nicholas* his similitude which he maketh betwixt God the first and vniuersall cause of all effectes, and the Pope the vniuersall Bishop; I answere, that as God can supplie the externall actions of second causes, called *Actiones transeuntes*, & therefore can produce heate without fire, a man without a man, a tree without a tree, as he did in the first creation of things: Yet he cannot, as some hould, produce immanent actiōs without their particular causes, and powers: & so cannot produce the act of seing without the eye, of hearing, without the eare, of loue without

the

the will, of vnderſtading without the power of vnderſtanding. But howſoeuer; as God can produce the former externall actions without their particular cauſes, and ſo ſupplie the ſecond cauſe: So the Pope if he be not onelie elected Pope, but alſo conſecrated, can do all the actions by himſelfe, which Patriarches, Archbishops, Bishops, Prieſts and other inferiour Miniſters can do. For he can ordaine Miniſters, and confirme the baptized with the Bishop; he can conſecrate, abſolue, and miniſter other Sacraments, and preach with the Prieſt; Yea he can do other inferiour offices with the Deacon, Subdeacon and thereſt, though it be not ſo conuenient he ſhould. And ſoe as God cā be not onely an vniuerſall but alſo a particular cauſe, ſupplying the particular cauſe: ſo the Pope can be a particular Bishop, but then he muſt do the office of a particular Bishop by himſelfe, or his delegate, or take the Title of that particular Church vnto him.

25. That the Pope hath founded Seminaries of Prieſts for our countrie; that he hath ſent thether firſt Prieſts, and then Religious men (as *M. Nicholas* telleth vs *n* 8. and we all gratefullie acknowledge) to preach and miniſter Sacramentes in our Countrie; as this argueth his greate care of England, and his no leſſe charitie; ſo it argueth not (as *M. Nicholas* would make his reader beleiue) that he was our particular Bishop; he neither by himſelfe, nor by his delegate doing the office of a Bishop in England, nor euer hauing taken

taken vnto him the Title of the Bishop of England. And so since the decease of our ould Bishops, to these late yeares, in which his Holines sent vs twoe most worthie Bishops, England was no particular Church, because it had no particular Bishop to make it a particular Church.

26. And by this *M. Nicholas* may gather an answere to all that he sayeth *n.* 8. 9. 10. 12. 13. In his 11. nũber he obiecteth against this; that many places and *persons are exempt from the Iurisdiction of a Bishop, besides the Pope: neither did any man euer dreame, that for that cause they ceased to be particular Churches.* I here pitie *M. Nicholas* his arguing, and the necessitie he is driuen to, which *Cogit ad turpia.* For although monasteries be exempt from the Bishop and immediatlie subiect to the Pope; yet no particular cõgregation or multitude, that is a particular Church, can be exempt from a particular Bishop, as we haue proued out of *S. Cyprians* definition of a Church, vnlesse the Pope make himselfe particular Bishop of it. And therefore monasteries subiect onely to the Pope, and exẽpt from particular Bishops, are indeed members of the Church, but not a particular Church; vnlesse *M. Nicholas* will make euerie nunnerie of woemen a particular Church.

27. But here I cannot but meruayle that *M. Nicholas* thinketh it so strange that *M. Doctour* sayeth, that there cannot be a particular Church without a Bishop; and it should seeme thereby that

that he hath not much considered S. *Thomas* his doctrine in this pointe. For that this learned Doctour sayeth, that the *Church militant, is deriued by similitude from the Triumphant:* and he sayeth also that euerie Order of the Angels consisteth of diuers Angels subordinate to one Prince, who in this Doctours opinion is higher and perfecter in nature thē the rest, and is the particular Prince of that Order; and all the orders with their particular Princes are subiect to one supreme Angel, who is Prince of the three Hierarchies, and nine Orders of Angels: And therefore in the Church militant, in euerie notable parte of it, there must be, and most commonlie is, a Bishop, a spirituall Prince of that Church, and all the particular Churches with their particular Hierarches and Bishops, are subordinate to one supreme Bishop, the Pope, as *M. Doctour* hath proued in the 3. and 4. *Chapter* of his *Hierarchie.* And therefore in his 2. *Chapter* he sayeth that the Church is compared to a Kingdome, in which besides the King are Dukes, Earles, Marquises, Barons, &c. who are princes, in their kinde, of their particular dominions, and all are, with their Dominions & Lordships, subordinate to the King: and if any of these particular dominions be quite depriued of their Duke, or Earle, they are no more Dutchies or Earledomes; though still they be members of the Kingdome; and so that particular Prouince depriued of its Duke or Earle, giueth not that lustre to the Kingdome, which it hath by other par-

D. Th. libr. 4. gent. c. 76. n. 4. 1. p. q. 108. art. 1. 2. 3.

particular Lordships, and bodyes of the Kingdome.

28. In like manner the Church being a Hierarchie, is cõpoſed of diuers particular Churches of which euerie one hath its particular Bishop, who is not the Popes delegate, but an ordinarie, and a Prince in his kind: and the Church receiueth by this varietie of particular Bishops & particular Churches, a greate luſtre. And when any notable parte of it wanteth its particular Bishop and ſpirituall prince, although the Church remaine ſtill a Hierarchie, in reſpect of other particular Churches, which haue their particular Hierarche and Bishop; yet in reſpect of that parte of the Church, which hath no Bishop, and which therefore is not a particular Church or body, it is not perfectlie Hierarchicall, nor hath it by that parte of the Church that varietie, and luſtre, which it hath by other parts, of which euerie one hath its particular Bishop.

29. Wherefore when the Pope giueth to a countrie a delegated Bishop, though many times he giueth to the delegate more power then the ordinarie hath, although that countrie then be in its kinde a particular Church, yet it wanteth ſome perfection, it being not gouerned by an ordinarie Bishop and Paſtour, as other Churches are, it being more perfect, and more honorable to haue an ordinarie, then a delegate. And likewiſe if the Pope should ſend a ſimple Prieſt into Englãd with power to confirme, England should be in

be in its kinde a particular Church, but not in that degree of perfection, as if it had an ordinarie Bishop and Paſtour.

30. Whereas *M. Nicholas n.* 14. ſaieth that his laſt taske in this queſtion was to shew, that although he should freelie graunt that a particular Church cannot be without a Bishop; Yet it were not ſufficiente to proue that a Bishop could not be refuſed by reaſon of perſecution. He bringeth in this out of its place; and ſo muſt expect his anſwere in the next queſtion. Whereas he demaundeth a precept to receiue a Bishop, and that alſo indiſpenſable: Hath not *M. Doctour* in his 12. *Chapter* of his *Hierarchie* proued at large, that by the diuine lawe and inſtitution, beſides one ſupreme Bishop, there muſt be other Bishops in the Church, without which the Church cannot ſubſiſt, becauſe without particular Bishops of particular Churches, the whole Churches should not be Hierarchicall? Hath he not in his 13. *Chapter* proued alſo, that Bishops by the diuine inſtitution and law, are ſo neceſſarie, that euen in tyme of perſecution they are to gouerne the Church, as they euer haue done in the greateſt perſecution? Hath he not proued in his 12. *Chapter* that by the diuine ordinance, euerie great parte of the Church, ſuch as England, France, Spaine, is to haue its Bishop? But more of this in due place; where alſo I shall shew whether this diuine lawe houldeth in all circumſtances. What need then had *Maiſter Nicholas* to demande a precept

cept

cept where the Diuine law is ſo often inculcated.

M. NICHOLAS SMITH.

The reaſon which M. Doctour *addeth that: as the whole Church hath one ſupreme Bishop to gouerne it, ſo euerie particular Church alſo muſt haue its Bishop, or Bishops, elſe it should not be a particular Church, and ſo the whole and vniuerſall Church should not (as Chriſt hath inſtituted) be a Hierarchie compoſed of diuers particular Churches.* n.16.

REPLIE.

M. Nicholas wreſteth M. Doctours *argument to a wrong and odious ſenſe.*

31. *M. Doctours* argument is good and ſolid: for as the whole and vniuerſall Church requireth a ſupreme and vniuerſall Bishop ouer all, to make it a whole Church; ſo a particular Church requireth a particular Bishop to make it a particular Church, as aboue is often proued; and otherwiſe if particular Churches had not their particular Bishop, the whole and vniuerſall Church, which conſiſteth of many particular Churches, should not be a Hierarchie, as Chriſt hath inſtituted. But *M. Nicholas* not ſo modeſtlie as were to be expected of one of his coate, ſayeth that this argument deſerueth no anſwere, and why? *Becauſe*, ſayeth hee, *who dare ſay, that there is as great neceſſitie or obligation to haue a Bishop in euerie particular Church, as to haue one ſupreme head of the whole Catholike Church?*

32. And

32. And thus (as he vseth to doe) taking *M. Doctour* wilfullie or ignorantlie in a wrong sense he runneth on. For *M. Doctour* onely sayed, that as the whole and vniuersall Church cannot be a whole Church, without a supreme and vniuersall Bishop; so a particular Church cannot be a particular Church without a particular Bishop: whence by no Logick it followeth that there is absolutelie as greate necessitie of a particular Bishop, as of the vniuersall and supreme Bishop. Because the Church cannot be at all without a supreme Bishop, or nor without order to him, when the Sea is vacāt: but it may subsist though a particular Bishop, and his Church also should fall from the Church by Schisme or heresie, and it should still remaine Hierarchicall in other particular Churches, which haue their particular Bishops, as is easie to see by that, which is allreadie saied. For although the Greeke Church for the greatest parte be cutte of from the Romaine Church by schisme and heresie, and so the Roman Church in it, is not Hierarchicall, yet the Roman Church still subsisteth, and is Hierarchicall in other Churches.

And this I shall illustrate by an example. The Empire is an vniuersall Kingdome which containeth in it diuers particular Kingdomes. Wherefore as the whole Kingdome of the Empire cannot be a whole Kingdome without a supreme King and Emperour; so a particular Kingdome of the whole Empire cannot be a particular King-

Kingdome without a particular King, but yet there is not absolutelie such necessitie of a particular King or Kingdome, as of the Emperour, who is supreme King. For that although that a particular King and Kingdome should be cassired, and should be no more a Kingdome, nor haue its particular King, yet the Empire might still subsist by its supreme King and Emperour, and by other Kingdomes, which are governed by him. And therefore *M. Nicholas* forceth me to say that he sheweth a greate deale of splene towards *M. Doctour*, in taking *M. Doctour* in a wrong sense, as though he had sayed that there was as great necessitie of a particular, as of a supreme Bishop; and then inferring, *that his doctrine is subiect to a deeper censure then he is willing to expresse.*

33. And what Censure, I pray you, *M. Nicholas* deserueth it to say, that as the whole Catholike Church cannot be without a supreme and vniuersall Bishop; so a particular Church cannot be a particular Church, without a particular Bishop? In what councell doth *M. Nicholas* find this censured? And doth not common sense and reason censure *M. Nicholas*, for calling this in question? Is it any more then to saye, that as an Empire and vniuersall Kingdome requireth a supreme King and Emperour, so a particular Kingdome of the sayed Empire requireth a particular King? And to inferre hence that *M. Doctour* sayeth a particular Bishop is as necessarie, as the supreme Bishop is, to vphould the Church of

God, is as absurd, as to inferre that a particular King, is as necessarie to vphould the Empire as the Emperour himselfe is.

34. And so when *M. Nicholas* addeth: *what Catholike dare auouch that because England for the space of 60. yeares wanted a Bishop, the vniuersall Church, that tyme was not, as Christ instituted, a Hierarchie composed of diuers particulars*: is of the same stuffe, for where or when did *M. Doctour* euer say thus as *M. Nicholas* maketh him to say? I confesse *M. Nicholas* his cauilling in this manner and false construing, yea false alledging, would moue some litle passion in mee; but that I am resolued to imitate *M. Doctours* temper and milde manner of writing, of which he giueth mee example in his *Hierarchie*. *M. Doctour* sayed onely that the Church cannot subsiste a *Hierarchie*, as Christ instituted, vnlesse it be composed in generall of diuers particular Churches which haue their particular Bishops: but he neuer sayed that the Church cannot subsist without a particular Church, nor that all the time England was without a Bishop, the rest of the Church, composed of particular Churches, which were, and are, and euer shalbe subordinate to the supreme Bishop, was not, as Christ instituted, a Hierarchie: as aboue he is sufficiently tould: onely he sayed, that England, so long as it wanted a Bishop was not a particular Church: and that the whole Church should not be a Hierarchie, if it were not composed of particular Churches and Bishops: Which it may be,

and

and was in other particular Churches, when England wanted a Bishop, and should still be so, although (as God forbidde) England were quite cutte of from the whole Church and had not one Catholike in it.

35. Hauing thus demonstrated *M. Dollows* doctrine which auerred that a people, Prouince, or Countrie, cánot be a particular Church without a particular Bishop, and consequentlie that all the time England wanted a Bishop it was not a particular Church: atid hauing also detected in *M. Nicholds* wilfull or ignorat mistakings, which commonly are the grouds of all his arguments, & hauing answered to all his arguments; I will go to the next question, if first I adde this; that seing that England when it had no particular Bishop was no particular Church; *M. Nicholas* and his brethren, out of the loue they ought to beare to their countrie, should labour with the Clergie that we may alwayes haue a Bishop or Bishops, by whome we may haue the honour to be a particulat Church, and enioy many other comforts and commodities which other countries enioye by their Bishops, which to English Catholikes seeme most necessarie by reason of their persecution.

THE THIRD QVESTION.

VVhether by the diuine law euerie particular Church muſt haue its Bishop.

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

TWo proue, that a particular Countrie may not refuſe Bishops, by reaſon of perſecution, M. Doctour *in his* 14. Chapter *alledgeth, that it is* De Iure diuino, *of the diuine lawe, to haue a particular Bishop in euerie particular Church, and for proofe he citeth* Sotus *affirming it to be of the diuine lawe &c. and* Bannes *teaching &c. in* 1.

THE REPLY.

1. I Confeſſe *M. Doctour* in his 14. *Chapter* auerreth that a particular Countrie cannot except againſt a Bishop ſent by lawfull authoritie; & one grounde thereof is becauſe by the diuine law & inſtitution, not onlie the whole and vniuerſall Church muſt haue an vniuerſall and ſupreme

preme Bishop, but also there must be in the whole Church diuers particular Churches, gouerned by particular Bishops euen in time of persecutiō, as he hath prooued in his 13. *Chapter.* And this also he proueth in the beginning of his 14. *Chapter n.* 1. Yea *M. Nicholas num.* 4. saieth, *that certaine it is, that* Iure diuino, *by the diuine lawe, the Church must be gouerned by Bishops, that is, in the whole Church there must be some Bishops: but to affirme that it is* De iure diuino *to haue a particular Bishop in the particular Church* of *England, and not onelie that there is such a precept, but moreouer, that no persecution can excuse the obligation thereof, or giue sufficient cause of dispensation (all which he must proue if he will speake home) is a paradox.*

2. But softe, *M. Nicholas, bona verba quæso.* Remember your ould fault of which you haue beene so often tould. By your leaue you make *M. Doctour* to say more then he doth, that he may seeme to speake Paradoxes, and you may haue more aduantage. For *M. Doctour* in the same *Chapter num.* 3. (which *M. Nicholas* would not see) graunteth that if the persecution be so great *that a Bishop would not be permitted to enter into England, or would presentlie be taken and put to death; then it was to no purpose to send a Bishop with euident hazard of his life, and no hope of good to the people by sending him;* and so in that case the obligation of hauing a Bishop should cease. But, (sayeth M. Doctour in the same place.) *If a Bishop may be had, and may so liue in a Countrie (as he may in England)*

gland) that as there is feare leaſt he be apprehended, ſo there is hope he may eſcape ſometime, and ſo do ſome notable good: I do not thinke that the Catholikes of that Countrie can except againſt his entrance.

3. Nor doth *M. Doctour* denie that the Pope may diſpenſe in the diuine lawe, or declare that in ſome caſes it ceaſeth to oblige: yea he ſpeaketh not at all of diſpenſation in the diuine lawe. Yet *M. Doctour* knoweth that the chiefe Paſtour may diſpenſe in vowes, and in Matrimonie contracted onelie, not conſummated; which yet are of the diuine lawe.

4. And he knoweth alſo the diuine lawes in many circunſtances do not oblige. As for example euerie one is bound by the diuine lawe to receaue the B. Sacrament, at the hower of his death leaſt he aduenture on that ſo dangerous iorney from this life to the next, without his *Viaticum*; and yet, though a Prieſt be preſent, if he haue not holie veſtements (without which the Church commandeth not to celebrate Maſſe) he muſt not ſay Maſſe, becauſe he cannot ſay it in that manner as he ſhould, and the ſicke perſon is, in that occurance of the eccleſiaſticall law, freed from diuine obligation to communicate.

5. So the Prieſt by the diuine law is bound not to giue the B. Sacrament to any whome he koweth to be in mortall ſinne, and ſo vnworthie; and yet if this partie be a ſecret ſinner (though knowne to the Prieſt) and demaund of the Prieſt in publike to communicate he is bound

to communicate him, leaſt he defame him; and the diuine lawe which forbiddeth the Prieſt to giue the B. Sacrament to vnworthie Perſons according to that: *do you not giue the holie to dogges;* doth in that caſe ceaſe to oblige the Prieſt. *Mat. 7.*

6. Soe it is a common opinion of deuines whome *Vaſquez* alledgeth, that by the diuine lawe whoſoeuer is in mortall ſinne muſt confeſſe that ſinne before he preſume to receaue the *B. Sacrament*; which they proue out of thoſe words of *S. Paul: But let a man proue himſelfe, and ſo let him eate of the breade and drinke of the Chalice*; which probation of ones ſelfe, the *Councell* of *Trent* defineth to be by Confeſſion; and yet if the Prieſt at Maſſe, or the lay partie, that is in companie kneeling before the altar, remember at that time his ſinne, he may communicate, if by omitting to do ſo he ſhould defame himſelfe. And ſo in that caſe alſo the diuine lawe ceaſeth to bind to confeſſion, and it will excuſe him from the ſinne of vnworthie receauing, if he endeauour to get contrition. *Vaſq. tom. 3. diſp. 207. c. 4. 1. Cor. 11. Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 13 cap. 7.*

7. And *Nauarre* feareth not to ſay, *that it is Omnium vna concluſio &c. it is a concluſion of all, that many lawes, agreeing to many by the diuine and naturall lawe, are reſtrained by the chiefe Prince of the Church, in regard of ſpirituall things; and of the ſecular Prince, in reſpect of temporall matters, as well by interpretation betwixt right and equitie interpoſed, as by impoſition of punishment, as by iuſt diſpenſation, as by iuſt and naturall reaſon, and Felinus, Decius* *Nauar in Sil. mac. 27. n. 263.*

and others do copiouſlie deliuer.

8. Wherefore *M. Doctour* doth not ſay that the Pope cannot in ſome caſes diſpenſe in the diuine lawe, of hauing a Bishop, or declare that in ſonne caſe it bindeth not, and therefore did not preſume to ſay that the Pope, all this whlie he gaue not England a Bishop, did commit a ſinne againſt the diuine law; rather he defendeth him from all ſinne in his 14. *Chapter n.* 3. Onelie he ſaieth that the Coũtrie cannot except againſt the entrãce of a Bishop (ſoe he be ſent by lawfull authoritie, as our two laſt moſt Reuerend Bishops were) for that then the Pope rather declareth that the diuine lawe ceaſeth not to oblige: and therefore let our Regulars looke how they can be excuſed, who except againſt a Bishop, whome the Pope hath ſent, and who, no doubt, was informed of all circumſtances: and therefore knew whether it were conuenient to ſend him at that time or not. And truelie ſeing the Pope hath ſent him, all Regulars, and they eſpeciallie who haue boũd themſelues particularlie to the Pope by a fourth vowe, ſhould by a perfect reſignation conforme their willes to his will, receiue and embrace his Bishop with all obedience and humilitie.

M. NICHOLAS SMITH.

But although we ſhould graunt, that as M. Doctour *affirmeth, a great or notable parte of the Church could not* Iure diuino *be gouerned without a Biſhop: yet that would be farre from prooning, that England, as thinges now ſtand, muſt needs haue a*

Bishop.

Bishop. For if our Countrie be considered not materiallie, but formallie (as diuines expresse themselues) that is not the extent of Land &c. n. 7.

THE REPLY.

Supposing it be of the diuine law that a greate or notable parte of the Church could not be without a Bishop, whether England as things now stand, must needs haue a Bishop?

9. *M. Nicholas* saieth first that although we should suppose that a notable part cannot be without a Bishop, yet England (see how fauorable he is to his countrie) might spare a Bishop, or at lest must not needs haue one. And why *M. Nicholas*? because (sayeth he) we must not consider the extent of the land, but the number of Catholikes in England, which, as he telleth vs, is so farre from a great, or notable parte of the Church, that the Catholikes in England would scarce make one Bishopricke or Dioceſe. *And* (saieth he) *to affirme that one Dioceſe or Cittie is a notable parte of the Church, is a thing which noe diuine, yea no man of Iudgement, will say. But by this wee may see into what absurdities partialitie may lead men.*

10. See, how to hinder English Catholikes, from a Bishop, what an handfull of people he maketh them. The Ancient Fathers and writers, as *Iustinus Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *S. Leo* cited by *M. Doctour* in his Epistles Dedicatories to his Suruey, and Hierarchie, gloried in the encreaſe of Chri-

stians;

ſtians, maugre the furie of perſecution; and *M. Doctour* in the ſame Epiſtles comforteth and encourageth the Catholikes of England, that notwithſtāding the like rage of perſecutiō there are Catholikes in the Court, in the Vniuerſities, Cities, Townes, Cottages, priſons: & are foūd amidſt the Magiſtrates; yea Miniſters (if we regard their hartes) and amongſt all ſortes of people: And this is a comfort to Catholikes, a glorie to God, and an honour to Chuſte his Church, and Religion, for which Catholikes ſuffer. But *M. Nicholas* to hinder England from a Bishop, who ſeemeth to be an eye ſore vnto him, maketh English Catholikes an handfull of men, a litle, and, as it were, a contemptible number not worthie a Bishop. But, thankes be God, who hath the more multiplied English Catholikes, the more with the Iſraelites they haue beene oppreſſed, they are not ſo few, as *M. Nicholas* maketh them; and in this *Inimici noſtri ſunt Iudices: Our enemies* (our perſecutors) *may herein be Iudges.*

Exod. 1.

Deut. 32.

11. But if they were not ſo many, as they be, yet Confirmation, and conſequentlie a Bishop, eſpeciallie in time of perſecution, were neceſſarie to confirme them *virtute exalto*; with vertue of the holy Ghoſt from aboue; which vertue and force, is the effect of Confirmation. Neither is the caſe of England, and of one particular Dioceſe annearing and ioyning to others, all one. For that one Dioceſe may be helped by another adioyning to it, or by recourſe to the Bishop of it, if there

Luca. 24.

there shalbe heed, whereas England, as the Poët sayeth, *is Deuided*, by Sea, *from the whole world*, and cannot haue conuenient succour, but by its owne Bishop, with in it selfe.

12. And againe *M. Nicholas* sayeth not truely that the multitude of Catholikes, not the extent of the place, is onelie to be considered, for in the primatiue Church, as *S. Clement* in his *Epistle to S. Iames*, called the brother of our Lord, or as diuers thinke, to *S. Simeon S. Iames* his successour, which is alledged in the Canon law, and by Suarez and other diuines, sayeth, that in the primatiue Church, in those Cities, which before their conuersion, were esteemed Capitall Cities, and were gouerned by *Archflamines*, primates and Patriarches were constituted; and in lesser cities, which had before their conuersion lesser *Flamines*, Archbishops were placed, and in other lesser Cities, one onelie Bishop in one Citie, not two in one, were appointed. And Pope *Anaclete*, alledging out of *S. Clement*, whome he calleth his predecessour, the same words in effect, sayeth that this was done by *S. Peter*, and *S. Clement*, and himselfe, ORDINANTE DOMINO, *Our Lord so ordaining*. And the same *S. Anaclete* (as *M. Doctour* had alledged in the fift *Chapter* of his *Hierarchie n.* 11.) in the same *third Epistle* hath these words: *Episcopi autem, non in castellis, aut modicis Ciuitatibus debent constitui, sed presbyteri per castella, aut modicas ciuitates atque villas debent ab Episcopis constitui: Bishops not in castels or litle walled townes, must be* consti-

Dist. 80. cap. In illis vero ciuitatibus.

Suarez to. 3. l. 2 de status perf. c. 17. n. 5

Anael. ep 3 & refert. d 90. c. Episcopi.

conſtituted: but Prieſts muſt by the Bishop be placed in Caſtels or litle Cities: And he giueth the reaſon: *Ne vileſcat nomen Epiſcopi,* leſt the name of a Bishop should be leſſe eſteemed.

13. Soe that a regard was had (whatſoeuer *M. Nicholas* ſaieth) to the extent of the place where a Bishop was to be placed) and not onelie to the number of Chriſtian Catholikes there liuing. When *S. Peter* choſe Rome the Heade Citie of the Empire for himſelfe and his ſucceſſours; whē *S. Marke* was placed at *Alexandria, S. Euodius,* and after him *S. Ignatius* at *Antioche,* and *S. Iames,* and after him *S. Simeon* at *Hieruſalem,* they had reſpect to the materiall greateneſſe, and the dignitie of the place; & in ſuch places appointed Patriarches or primates, who had vnder them other Bishops; becauſe the extent of the place required it. And although at firſt, in ſome of theſe Citties there were not ſo many Chriſtiās as were afterward in one Dioceſe; Yet they perceiuing that in theſe great Cities and extentes of place there might be many more Chriſtiās, which might be encreaſed by the preſence and induſtrie of their Prelate, they placed in them Patriarches or Archbishops, or Bishops according to the extent of the place. Who as ſpirituall Fathers may beget many thouſands to Chriſt, and may rule them when they are begotten; as the carnall Father firſt begetteth, then gouerneth his children.

14. *M. Nicholas* hath read in his Breuiarie 17. Nou. how *S. Gregorie* called *Thaumaturgus* of the wonderous

derous miracles he wrought: at the hower of his death, demaūding how many infidels there were remanent in his Citie, and anſwere being made that there were ſeuenteen; God be thanked, ſaied hee, I found ſo many when I accepted of my Bishopricke. Where *M. Nicholas* may ſee that for the placing of a Bishop, there was had a regard not onely to the number of the Chriſtians, but alſo to the extent, and greateneſſe of the place; otherwiſe ſeuenteene Chriſtians should not by *M. Nicholas* his counte haue had a Bishop. And the reaſon is, which *M. Nicholas* conſidered not; for that a Bishop is appointed, not onely as a Ruler to gouerne Chriſtians already conuerted, but as a Father to beget Chriſtians by his preaching, and example as *Saint Paule* and the Apoſtles did, who at their firſt preaching found few or none to gouerne, yet by their preaching were Fathers of the whole world. And ſo although in England there were not ſo many Catholikes as there are in one Dioceſe in a Catholike Countrie (though, thankes be to God, there are many thouſand Catholikes, and many hundred Prieſts, who deſerue a Bishop to gouerne them, and to confirme thoſe that haue not Confirmation) yet England by reaſon of the extent of the Iſland might require a Bishop, yea many Bishops, in that ſo greate an Iſland is capable of many more Catholikes, then a Dioceſe cā hould, eſpeciallie if it may enioye the benefit of a Bishop or Bishops.

15. But

15. But I doe not meruaile that *M. Nicholas* laboureth ſo hard to hinder Englād from a Bishop; for that peraduēture he is of the opinion of thoſe, who in *An anſwere to the Bishop of Chalcedons letter, to the Lay Catholikes of England, which was ſent vnto him by the Heades of three Regular Orders*, do call Epiſcopall authoritie in Englād, and in theſe times *a Noueltie*, though as ould as Chriſt and his Apoſtles; *Odious*, though proceeding from Chriſt his loue to his Church, vnto which it is much beneficiall; *Derogating to the ancient lawes of England*, though England by Bishops hath many hundred yeares beene conſerued in religion, pietie, ſanctitie & all eccleſiaſticall ſplendour; *Pernicious to ſoules*, though inſtituted for their gaining, gouernement and ſaluation. Which opinion, in a manner is worſe then *Caluins* opinion, for that it is leſſe iniurious to Chriſt, to denie all Epiſcopall authoritie, as *Caluin* doth, then to ſay that Chriſt hath inſtituted and giuen to his Church an authoritie, which is a *Noueltie; odious, derogating to temporall laws of Kings; pernicious to ſoules.* I ſay, *In a manner*; for that theſe Regulars do not abſolutelie ſpeake in theſe termes of Epiſcopall authoritie; but onely in England, in this time of perſecutiō, they counte it a Noueltie, wee hauing not had till of late a Bishop of long time; odious, derogating to ancient lawes and pernicious, at this time: Which yet will hardly ſerue for a iuſt excuſe, Chriſt hauing inſtituted this authoritie and giuen it to the Apoſtles in the beginning of the greateſt

greateſt perſecution, and they hauing exerciſed it in the greateſt furie of perſecution, maugre all the lawes threates and menaces of the cruell perſecutours. And if Epiſcopall authoritie in time of perſecution be odious and pernicious; when ſhall it be gratefull and profitable. Certes if when the wolfe inuadeth the flocke, the Paſtours preſence be odious and pernicious when can it be profitable?

M. NICHOLAS SMITH.

Enough hath beene ſayed to diſproue M. Doctours *Tenet in this preſent queſtion, yet nothing will more diſaduãtage his aſſertion that when the reader ſhall by my anſwere clearly perceiue his owne augments, ether to goe beſide the matter, or to proue againſt* himſelfe. *n.* 8. And *n.* 9. *his firſt argument is taken out of Sotus affirming it to be* De Iure diuino *of the diuine law* &c.

REPLIE.

Sotus *his opinion concerning that point, whether by the diuine law; euerie Church muſt haue its Bishop, maketh for* M. Doctour, *and againſt* M. Nicholas.

16. *M. Nicholas* braggeth that he hath ſayed enough, and in deed to much vnleſſe he had ſaied more to the purpoſe, as partely hath beene, shewed partely shall: but (ſayeth he) *nothing will more diſaduantage his aſſertion, then when the Reader ſhall ſee by my anſwers, that* M. Doctours *arguments are beſides the matter, or againſt himſelfe.* Thus he: but by his leaue he ſtill continueth his ould fault

in

in making *M. Doctour* say more then he doth. For *M. Doctour* doth not impose vpon *Sotus* more then he sayeth, as *M. Nicholas* imposeth on *M Doctour*. *M. Doctour* onely relateth *Sotus* his words, leauing the Reader to conceiue that sense which the words offer. And although *M. Doctour* doth not say so much of him, or his words: Yet his words may verie well haue; Yea indeed haue a sense which fauoureth *M. Doctour*.

17. Let vs therefore heare *Sotus* his words: He sayeth it is *De iure diuino quod in genere singulis Ecclesijs, secundum Ecclesiasticam diuisionem, sui applicentur Episcopi; it is of the diuine law, that in generall, to euerie particular Church, according to the Ecclesiasticall diuision, their proper Bishops are to be applyed.* Which words may verie well haue, and indeed haue another interpretation; then *M. Nicholas* giueth, and they doe clearelie fauour that which *M. Doctour* sayed; to wit, that by the diuine law, euerie particular Church, at lest which is a notable parte of the whole Church (of which *M. Doctour* speaketh) should haue its Bishop. For, supposing that Christ hath instituted a Hierarchie composed of diuers particular Churches, gouerned by particular Bishops, and hath giuen to the Church authoritie to make this diuision of diuers Churches and Dioceses; *Sotus*, as by the former words may be gathered, is of opinio, that supposing the diuision of Dioceses, euerie Diocese (much more euerie notable part of the Church, as England, France &c.) is by the diuine law and

Sotus. l 10. de Iust. & Iure q 1. ar. 4.

ap-

appointement to haue its Bishop, not Peter, or Paul, but one indeterminatelie: and this by vertue of our Sauiours institution in generall, whereby that order is sette generallie, and euerie where to be obserued, *Singulis Ecclesijs vt sui applicentur Episcopi*; *that to euerie particular Church their proper Bishop should be applyed*. And thus in generall, the election of Bishops is *De iure diuino*, *of the diuine law*. And therefore when a Pope doth applie a Bishop to a Dioceſe, he doth but that which our Sauiour, hath before instituted in his generall institution, and commandement, *Vt singulis Ecclesijs sui applicentur Episcopi*; *that to euerie Church their proper Bishops should be applyed*.

18. That the diuision of Dioceſes is Eccleſiasticall, that is, introduced by the Church, it is not materiall; for that according to *Sotus* the diuine law still is generall, commanding in generall that all Dioceſes diuided by the Church, be they more or fewer, of greater or leſſe extent, each muſt haue its Bishop in it.

19. So our B. Sauiour hauing instituted in generall, that vnder euerie hoſt rightlie conſecrated, there shall infalliblie be his ſacred bodie; be the hoſt conſecrated diuided into many or fewe, greate or ſmall partes (which determination depẽdeth of man, as the diuiſion of Dioceſes dependeth of the Church) the bodie of Chriſt is in each of them, by vertue of the conſecration. And that this is the meaning and ſcope of *Sotus*, may appeare by theſe words of *Sotus* himſelfe:

Nunquid propterea, quod per Ministrum Dei, illa facta fuerit applicatio, continuo sit consequens non fuisse diuinam? Doth it therefore follow that it is not the diuine Institution, that euerie Dioceſe should haue its Bishop, *because that application*, of a particular Bishop to a particular Dioceſe, *was made by the minister of God*? Out of which *M. Doctour* may inferre againſt *M. Nicholas* that, in the opinio of *Sotus*, according to the diuine lawe, euerie Dioceſe muſt haue its Bishop, and *M. Nicholas* can inferre nothing againſt, but rather for *M. Doctour*, to witte that at leſt by the diuine law, euerie notable parte of the Church (as England, France &c.) muſt haue its Bishop.

20. To this. *M. Nicholas* anſwereth *n.* 10. that *Sotus* his meaning is not, that the Pope is obliged by the diuine law *to giue particular Bishops to euerie particular Dioceſe, but onelie, that when the Pope doth confirme and conſecrate a Bishop, and giue him charge of ſome particular Dioceſe, in ſuch caſes he doth a particular action, which in generall was inſtituted and commaunded by our Sauiour Chriſt, who ordained in generall, that in the whole Church, there ſhould alwayes be ſome Bishops.* This *M. Nicholas* confirmeth by *Sotus* his owne words in the ſame place, where he ſayeth: *Dum Dei miniſter &c. Whileſt the miniſter of God by his command diſpenſeth that which he* (God) *inſtituted, the action is to be eſteemed of the diuine law: but when the Pope doth confirme and conſecrate a Bishop and apply him to ſome Church, he executeth that which Chriſt in generall* (*Marke*) *did inſtitute, and which he commanded them to do; there-*

fore such an action ought to be sayed of the diuine law: Whence *M. Nicholas* sayeth, it is plaine against *M. Doctour*, that *Sotus* speaketh of the Institution of Christ onely in generall.

21. But *M. Nicholas*, goeth about to deceiue men in generalities, when he biddes vs *Marke*, that *Sotus* sayeth that Christ onely instituted and cõmaunded in generall that there should be Bishops. For that this may haue two meanings; the one, that Christ instituted and communded onely in generall, that there should be Bishops in the Church; and this is *M. Nicholas* his interpretation: The other, that Christ in generall instituted and commanded, that not onely in generall there should be Bishops in the Church, but also that euerie particular Church or Dioceſe (after the diuiſion of Dioceſes made) should haue its Bishop, and this is *Sotus* his meaning, as I haue shewed out of his words aboue alledged; and as may appeare euen by his last words cited by *M. Nicholas*; for *Sotus* sayeth there, that *when the Pope doth confirme and consecrate a Bishop and apply him to some Church, he executeth that which Christ commanded in generall* to do, that is, to confirme, and consecrate, and apply a Bishop to the Church, ouer which he giueth him charge. And *Sotus* in the former place alledged by *M. Doctour* sayeth not onely, that there must in generall by the diuine law be Bishops in the Church, but also that it is *of the diuine law that in generall to euery particular Church, according to the Eccleſiaſticall diuiſion,* *Sotus supra l. 10. q. 1. ar. 4.*

uision, their proper Bishops are to be applyed.

Sotus l. 10 de Iust & iure q 3 ar. 4.

22. That this is *Sotus* his opinion it may appeare also by other places: as where he sayeth: *Cum enim ius diuinum sit, vt vnicuique suus mancipetur Episcopus, idque (vt demonstratum est) propter peculiarem curam & vigilantiam, quæ eidem Ecclesiæ est necessaria &c.* For *seing that it is the diuine law, that to euerie Dioceſe its owne Bishop should be mancipated or bound*; (he sayeth not onely that in generall there must by the diuine law be some Bishops in the Church, but also that by the diuine law to euerie Dioceſe its owne Bishop must be bound and mancipated) and then he giueth the reason, *for the peculiar care and vigilancie, which is necessarie to that Church:* And in another

Sot in 4 dist 20 q 1. art. 5 Concl. 1.

place he giueth also the reason why the Pope onely is not sufficient to gouerne the whole Church without Bishops, nor a Bishop the whole Dioceſe without Pastours: *Si autem aliarum rationem desideres, hæc est egregia, quod officium Pastoris est ad salutem gregis oculatè attendere: supremus autem Ecclesiæ Pastor non sufficit toti Ecclesiæ prospicere, nisi singulis Diœcesibus Episcopos præficiat; neque Episcopus toti Diœcesi, nisi parochijs, parochiales Sacerdotes præponat. But if thou desire the reason of others, this is a notable reason, because the office of a Pastour is to attend with a vigilant eye to the safetie of the flocke: but the supreme Pastour is not sufficient to looke to the whole Church, vnleſſe he ordaine to each Dioceſe a Bishop, and vnleſſe the Bishop constitute Parish Priests to the Parochiall Churches.* So that

seing

ſeing the Pope is bound ſby the diuine law to haue care of the whole Church; and that according to *Sotus*, he cannot looke ſufficiently to the Church vnleſſe he appoint to eche Dioceſe a Bishop, it followeth in *Sotus* his opinion, that by the diuine law, he is bound to giue euerie Dioceſe his Bishop, as the Bishop is bound to giue to euerie Parish its Paſtour.

23. But *M. Nicholas n.* 10. ſayeth that *Sotus* alſo ſayeth that ſacramentall abſolution, and the like are to be eſteemed of the diuine law; and yet it were a madneſſe, out of theſe words to inferre, that the miniſter is bound by the diuine law, to adminiſter Sacraments. I anſwere, that the Sacraments are of the diuine law, though men diſpenſe them: and ſo according to *Sotus*, that euerie Church should haue its Bishop, it is of the diuine law, though the Pope elect him. This is the Scope of *Sotus*, as appeareth by theſe words, *Nunquid propterea quod per miniſterium* Dei *&c. Is it therefore any conſequence, that the application is not diuine, becauſe it was done by the Miniſter of God.* And *M. Nicholas* out of this cannot inferre any thing for his purpoſe.

24. Now whether all this which *Sotus* ſaieth, be true or no, *M. Doctour* did not examine; he intending onely to shew that his owne aſſertion, *pag.* 376. *n.* 2. which affirmeth it to be the diuine law, that euerie notable part of the Church (ſuch as is England, Spaine, France) should haue its Bishop, was moderate, in reſpect of the aſſer-

tion of *Sotus*, who ſayed that euerie Dioceſe by the diuine law, in the aforeſayed ſenſe, muſt haue its Bishop. And to this purpoſe onelie he cited *Sotus*. And therefore that was not modeſtlie, nor truelie ſaied of *M. Nicholas*; but odiouſlie, and not ſo charitablie, as might be expected of him, in the 10. *number* towards the end, where he he ſayeth; *Finallie* M. Doctour, *I doubt not wilbe more circumſpect in alledging authours, leſt he doth wrong his owne reputation, the Authours themſelues, the Reader, and moſt of all the trueth*. Rather *M. Nicholas* should haue beene more modeſt, and more carefull of the trueth in his words. For that *M. Doctour* doth not ſay ſo much as *Sotus* doth (as *M. Nicholas* would make him) but onelie alledged him, to shew that this aſſertion, in reſpect of that of *Sotus*, was moderate; *M. Doctour* affirming onely, that it was of the diuine law, that euerie notable parte of the Church, ſuch as England, France, Spaine, should haue its Bishop; *Sotus* auerring that by the ſame diuine law euerie Dioceſe ought to haue its Bishop, which is much more then *M. Doctour* ſayed: and that this was *Sotus* his opinion is shewed out of his words; and ſo not *M. Doctour*, but *M. Nicholas* alledgeth authours contrarie to their meaning.

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

The ſecond Authour alledged by M. Doctour *is* Bannes, *ſaying; that Bishops cannot by the Pope be remoued from the whole Church, or a great or notable parte thereof. I wonder* M. Doctour *would alledge*

alledge this learned diuine &c. num. 11.

REPLIE.

Bannes *his opinion concerning that point; whether it be a diuine law, that euerie notable part of the Church, must haue its Bishop, and whether* Bannes *maketh for* M. Nicholas, *and against* M. Doctour. Bann. 2.2 q. 1. ar 10 Concl. 6. ad vlt.

25. To this I shall endeauour to answere with much more moderation then *M Nicholas* vseth. I answere thē that *M. Doctour* did not alledge *Bannes* to proue that euerie particular Church or Diocese, is to haue a Bishop; neither doth *M. Doctour* euer say so, as *M. Nicholas* himselfe obserueth *n.* 14. but he alledged the sense of that Authour, as he did of *Sotus*, to shew that his assertion or opinion was moderate. And that which is cited as the sense of *Bannes*, is manifest the there in these words: *Non tamen admittendum est, quod in tota Ecclesia, aut in magna eius parte, tam temere* (Pontifex) *sua potestate abutatur: Yet it is not to be admitted, that the Pope in the whole Church, or in a great parte of it, should so rashly abuse his authoritie.* And what is this, but what *M. Doctour* sayed, to wit, that Bishops, according to *Bannes* cannot be remoued from the whole Church, or *a great or notable parte of it*? And further that *Bānes* did beleiue that the Pope could not do this by reason of the diuine law, it is easilie gathered, by the example, he bringeth; and by those words: *tam temerè sua potestate abutatur, that he should so rashlie abuse his authoritie*: for were it an Ecclesiasticall impediment and law, he could

take it away. That *Bannes* ſayeth the Pope may remoue one Bishop, and not appoint another, may ſeeme to be againſt *Sotus*, but not againſt *M. Doctour*, who ſayeth not that euerie Dioceſe muſt haue by the diuine law a Bishop, but onely that at leſt euerie notable parte as England, France, &c. is to haue a Bishop by the diuine precept. Yet neither doth *Bannes* herein plainelie contradict *Sotus*; becauſe Sotus would alſo graũt, that it pertaineth to the Pope to diuide Dioceſes, and to make them greater or leſſe, and ſo to make of two one; and conſequentlie he would graunt to *Bannes*, that the Pope may take from a Dioceſe its proper Bishop, which it had, and ſubiect it to another Bishop, by making it parte of his Dioceſe: onelie *Sotus* ſaieth, that ſuppoſing the diuiſion of Dioceſes made by the Church, it is of Chriſtes inſtitution and the diuine law, that euerie Dioceſe ſhould haue its Bishop.

M. NICHOLAS.

The reaſon that M. Doctour *did inferre from the ſaied authorities maketh for him, iuſt as they did: It was thus: By the diuine law &c.* n. 12.

The trueth in the foreſaied pointe ſetting aſide opinions of authours.

26. Before I shew the force of *M. Doctours* argument, and the faulte of *M. Nicholas* his mãner of arguing, I shall explicate, and confirme *M. Doctour* his aſſertion, by which he auerreth, that by the

the diuine law, in euerie notable parte of the Church there must be a Bishop: Which I shall easilie do, supposing *M. Doctours* ground, to wit, that the Church must not be gouerned by one onelie supreme Bishop, but also by other particular Bishops, who are to gouerne particular Churches; becauſe the supreme Bishop alone cannot by himselfe gouerne the Church; and becauſe the Church is a Hierarchie. This ground *M. Doctour* hath proued in his 9. *Chapter* of his *Hierarchie* where he hath shewed, how Bishops, & inferiour Paſtours are to gouerne the Church, to preach, and administer Sacraments. Secondly in his 12. *Chapter*, where he hath proued that Bishops are so neceſſarie in the Church, that it cannot subsiſt without them. And thirdlie in his 13. *Chapter*, where he hath tould vs how euen in the time of perſecution, though it was the greater for the Bishops preſence, the Church was, and ought to be gouerned by Bishops. Whence it is conſequent, that by the diuine law, the Church must be gouerned by Bishops, and that in generall there must be particular Bishops in the Church of God: Which *M. Nicholas* also graũteth with *Suarez n.17.* And why are Bishops neceſſarie, but to gouerne, to preach, and miniſter Sacraments.

27. Out of which aſſured ground, I argue in this manner. There must be by the diuine law Bishops in the Church to gouerne it, and conſequentlie as manie as may ſuffice to ſupplie the neceſſities

neceſſities the Church hath of gouernment, preaching, and Sacraments: therefore by the ſame diuine Inſtitution and precept, there muſt be at leſt a Bishop in euerie notable parte of the Church, ſuch as is France, Spaine, England; for that fewer will not ſuffice; one Bishop being not ſufficient to ſerue all France, England, & Spaine, and in particular to confirme by the Sacrament of Confirmation all French and English.

28. I inſtance in *Confirmation*, becauſe other Sacraments may more eaſilie be in ſome ſort ſupplyed without a Bishop, eſpeciallie in the countrie; for that neither the English can go all into France, nor all the French into Englād to receaue Confirmation; neither can one Bishop go to one Countrie to ſerue it of Confirmation, without preiudice to the other countrie; nor can he, being but one, ſuffice for ſo many. Wherefore England muſt haue its owne Bishop, France its owne, Spaine its owne, and ſo of the reſt, if they be notable partes of the Church; all hauing the like neceſſitie; and there being the ſame reaſon of one, which is of another. And ſo *M. Doctour* in his 14. *Chapter n. 2. pag.* 376. argueth well from the like neceſſitie in this manner: *By the diuine law there muſt be particular Bishops in the Church*, to ſupply the neceſſities of particular Churches, *but there is no more reaſon why the particular Church, of France (for he ſpeaketh eſpeciallie of greate particular Churches, which are notable partes of the whole Church) ſhould be gouerned by a Bishop or Bishops,*

more

more or fewer, according to the extent of the Countrie, rather then the Church of Spaine; or the Church of England: Ergo *France, Spaine, and England, and all other ſuch particular Churches of extent, muſt be gouerned by Bishops*; and euerie one by his owne, all hauing the like neceſſitie,

29. *M. Nicholas numer.* 12. wondreth *that a learned man ſhould vſe ſuch a forme of argument*, and therefore to make a shew againſt this argument of *M. Doctour*, he bringeth other arguments verie ridiculous, which though they may ſeeme to the ignorante to be like, yet indeed are not ſo like as chalke and cheiſe. His firſt argument of diuers meates doth argue that hee was hungrie for wāt of arguments, elſe he would not haue made vſe of one ſo weake and leane. Thus he argueth: *Some meate is neceſſarie for the maintenance of man, but there is no more reaſon, why egges or fish ſhould be neceſſarie, rather then other particular meates*; Ergo *egges, fish and all meates are neceſſarie*.

30. But I meruaile that *M. Nicholas* (if he be learned) could not ſee the difference betwixt his owne and *M. Doctours* argument. For that hee argueth from the neceſſitie of ſome indeterminate meanes, to the neceſſitie of ſome determinate meanes: *Maiſter Doctour* argueth from like ends to the like neceſſarie meanes. The firſt manner of arguing, which *Maiſter Nicholas* vſeth, is ridiculous. For it followeth not: Meate which is an indeterminate meane, is neceſſarie for mans life. *Ergo* this meate; Bishops

are

are necessarie in the Church: *Ergo* this Bishop in particular; Marriage of some men is necessarie to maintaine lawfullie mankind: *Ergo* this man must marrie. *M. Doctours* manner of arguing is good and solid; for that it is grounded in paritie and equalitie of reason, or in this principle knowne by the light of reason: *Quod conuenit alicui quâ tale conuenit omni tali, that which agreeth to a thing, as it is such a thing, agreeth to euerie such thing:* as for example, sayeth Aristotele, because it agreeth to a Triangle, as it is a Triangle, to haue three angles equall to two right angles; it agreeth to euerie Triangle to haue three angles equall to two right angles; but because it agreeth not to a triangle, as it is a triangle, to be of brasse, euerie triangle is not of brasse. And so because it is necessarie to a notable parte of the Church, as it is a notable parte, to haue a Bishop, and that also by the diuine law, because one Bishop cannot serue sufficientlie two notable partes of the Church, euerie notable parte must haue its Bishop. And there being the same reason of England, Frãce, Spaine, euerie one of these countries, being of such extent, that one Bishop cannot serue two of them, euerie one of them must haue its Bishop by paritie of reason; and for that it being necessarie to a Church to haue a Bishop, because it is a notable parte, euerie such notable part must haue a Bishop: Because *quod conuenit alicui, quâ tale, conuenit omni tali: that which agreeth to a thing, as it is such a thing, agreeth to euerie such thing.* And if it be

Lib. 1. Post or c. 4. & 5.

ne-

neceſſarie to one, it is neceſſarie to another.

31. If *M. Nicholas* his argument had beene thus framed, it had beene good: Meate or food in generall is neceſſarie to mãs life: but there is no more reaſon of one man then another (for that all mortall men do need meate or food) *Ergo* meate or food is neceſſarie ot euerie mãs life, but this food in particular, as egges or fish is not neceſſarie.

32. *M. Nicholas* his ſecond argument is as ridiculous: for that by it he argueth from an indeterminate meane, to wit, from men whoe are neceſſarie to maintaine by marriage mankinde, to euerie particular man. Which kinde of argument is not the ſame with that of *M. Doctour*; but as fond as this: A shippe indeterminatelie is neceſſarie to paſſe from Douer to Calais, *Ergo* euerie particular shippe.

33. His thirde argument is of the ſame or of a worſe forme and ſtampe: *Religious inſtitute in generall is of the diuine inſtitution, and the Supreme Bishop is by his office obliged on his parte to procure that in the Catholike Church ſo ſacred an inſtitute be maintained: but there is no reaſon why it ſhould be be maintained rather in France or Spaine, then in England*: Ergo *the Pope is obliged to maintaine the religious inſtitute in England.* To his *maior* or firſt propoſition I anſwere that religious orders can be no more nor ſo much neceſſarie in the Church, then the Counſailes, in which, according to *S. Thomas*, they are grounded; which counſailes are inſtituted by Chriſte, but as *M. Doctour* ſaieth in his *Hierarthie pag.* 300. they are not commanded

2. 2. q. 108. ar. 4.

to anie, but counſailed onely. And ſo *M. Nicholas* cannot fynde out a diuine precept to oblige the Pope to admitte any religious order, as he is bound to giue Bishops to the Church: and hence it is that the Pope doth much deliberate before he admitte of any new Religious order; and whe he admitteth it, he admitteth it onely as profitable to the Church, not as neceſſarie by any diuine law.

34. But ſuppoſe it were of the diuine law, that religious orders indeterminatelie and in generall should be in the Church: yet no Religious order is neceſſarie by the diuine law in euerie notable part of the Church, as Bishops are. And ſo it would not be a good argument: Religious orders muſt by the diuine inſtitution be in the Church, *Ergo* in Englād, or in this or in that particular Coutrie. But, as I haue proued, it is of the diuine law that in euerie notable parte of the Church there muſt be a Bishop; and ſo there being no more reaſon of one ſuch parte, then another, all ſuch partes muſt haue their Bishops. This, I ſuppoſe, would be *M. Doctours* anſwere to that argument. Now let *M. Nicholas* make what he can of this anſwere. Who, verie politikelie perhappes, as he thought, ſaied. *n.* 13. *pag.* 50. *When M. Doctour shall tell me what he thinketh of this manner of argument, I will then let him know what good vſe I shalbe able to make of his anſwere, whatſoeuer it be.*

35. And by this *M. Nicholas* his fourth argument will proue to haue the ſame fault that the

others had: *It is not of the diuine law, as* M. Doctour *confesseth, to haue a Bishop in euerie particular Church or Dioceſe; but if we reſpect the diuine law, there is no more reaſon of one, then another*, Ergo *all the Dioceſes of England may be gouerned without a Bishop.* But *M. Doctour* would deny his *maior*, as it is Fathered on him: for he neither affirmeth nor denyeth that euerie Dioceſe muſt haue its Bishop: onely he ſayeth *pag.* 375. that it is not ſo certaine that by the diuine law, there muſt be a Bishop in this or that particular Church, as that in generall there muſt be Bishops in the Church: & *pag.* 376. he ſaieth that it is of the diuine law, that euerie notable parte of the Church should haue its Bishop. It is true *Sotus* ſaieth that it is of the diuine law that euerie Dioceſe should haue its Bishop: but M. *Doctour* neither affirmeth it, nor denyeth it. Secondly I anſwere that there is more reaſon and neceſſitie of a Bishop in a whole countrie or Kingdome, which is a notable parte of the Church, then in euerie particular Dioceſe, becauſe one Bishop may in ſome ſort gouerne two Dioceſes, but not all France, Spaine, or England, or any ſuch notable parte, as I haue shewed, and one Dioceſe may be aſſiſted by the Bishop of the next Dioceſe, but not one great Countrie by the Bishop of another countrie, as I haue alſo proued.

36. By this *M. Nicholas* may gather an anſwere to that his queſti ōn. 16. whether that England & Scotland *Iure diuino* muſt alſo haue an *Ordinarie*.

For

For if England & Scotland be both notable parts of the Church, both ought to haue by the diuine law their proper Bishop: be he *Ordinarie or delegate*: & when men demaund any thing, there is more reason to demaūd that which is ordinarie, thē that which is extraordinarie. And if the Pope thinke best to giue a *Delegate*; as so he may supplie Englāds wantes, so that is not the ordinarie course obserued in other Churches. And so Englād may demaund an *Ordinarie*, and leaue the rest to the Chiefe Pastours discretion; who is to Iudge whether he should giue an *Ordinarie*, or *delegate*, & whether the diuine law obligeth to giue vnto a countrie a Bishop in this or that circumstance.

37. Out of all this I gather how vnwilling *M. Nicholas* is to haue a Bishop. I graunt that he sayeth *pag.* 204. that he *would most willinglie spend his blood for the purchassing of times sutable with the enioying of a Catholike Bishop in England.* But what is that time which *M. Nicholas* deemeth sutable for the enioying of a Bishop? Would he haue a time which the supreme Pastour (whose office it is to giue Pastours to euerie Church) thinketh in his iudgement sutable? That tyme is alreadie come. Would he haue a time in which the countrie hath men of its owne, in it to be Bishops? that time is also come: for that two most worthie Prelates haue beene thought by the supreme Pastour fit and worthie to be sent, the one after the other. Would he haue a tyme in which there are not particular lawes

enacted

enacted against the Bishop? no confiscation of goods, no losse of libertie or life executed on them, that receiue Confirmation of him? That tyme also is come. Would he haue England altogether Catholike, and no vse of any other religion to be permitted in it, but Catholike, before he would haue a Bishop come? If that tyme onely be in *M. Nicholas* his opinion sutable, the primatiue Church liued in no time sutable for a Bishop; and yet Christ constituted his Apostles Bishops, and they constituted others in the greatest rage and furie of persecution, as *M. Doctour* hath shewed in his 13. *Chapter n.* 3. And to say that a time of persecution is not sutable for a Bishop, is to say, that when the enemie is in the field, it is not a time sutable to haue a Generall; when the woulfe is ready to set on the flocke, it is not a time sutable to haue a Pastour. And so the tyme of the primatiue Church, in which the Church was assalted by persecutours, in all Countries, and on all sides, was not a time sutable for enioying a Bishop. And yet that is the tyme in which there is most need of him, to giue them by *Confirmation* spirituall force and strength, to direct them by his counsaile, to encourage them by his presence, and example. If none of these tymes be sutable for a Bishop in *M. Nicholas* his opinion: The primitiue Christians should haue beene without a Bishop, till the Emperour *Constantine* appeased persecution; and Christ should not haue sent his Apostles to gouerne, preach and confirme, till the

 saied

ſaied tyme of *Conſtantine*: for all the tymes before being times of perſecutiō, were not by *M. Nicholas* his counte, ſutable to the enioying of a Bishop. If then neither the tyme that Chriſt thought fit to ſend Bishops, nor the tyme that the Apoſtles ordained Bishops, nor the time that Chriſt his chiefe Vicaires haue thought ſutable for the enioying of a Bishop in England, be ſutable in *M. Nicholas* his Iudgement; Let him name vs another tyme, which is ſutable: leaſt if he except againſt ſo many times, men may thinke that *M. Nicholas* deemeth no time ſutable for enioying a Bishop in England.

M. NICHOLAS.

What he alledgeth out of Suarez *to proue that the gouernement* &c. *n.* 17.

THE REPLY.

Suarez *is not againſt* M. Doctour, *but for him.*

37. *Suarez* in the place alledged by *M. Doctour* hath two reaſons, and it ſufficed *M. Doctour* to cite the one, becauſe the other matter, which the ſecond reaſon toucheth, was not controuerted, nor in queſtion. Euerie Reader of Iudgement would obſerue that in the citation nothing is wanting, but an *&c.* which was not neceſſarie, becauſe the firſt reaſon ſerued, *M. Doctours* turne, which was, that the Pope cannot change the gouernement of the Church becauſe the Church by Chriſt his inſtitution is a Monarchie, and a monarchie requireth not onelie one chiefe Monarche, but alſo other ſubordinate princes;

Suarez tom. 4. in 3. p. diſput 26. ſect 1. n 8.

Which

Which was enough to confirme what *M. Doctour* there intended, to wit, that in the Church there must be diuers particular Bishops and Churches. And the second reason, which *Suarez* alledgeth, as it was not necessarie to be alledged for *M. Doctours* purpose; so it was not left out as *M. Nicholas* rashlie iudgeth, because it made against *M. Doctour*, as it is manifest. His second reason therefore was: *tum etiam quia in republica Christiana &c. and also because in the Christian commonwealth this was most necessarie: for it is most ample and most vniuersall, and its gouernement is spirituall and interne, which is not done exactlie, but by proper Pastours and Princes of the Church.* And what is this against *M. Doctour*? rather it is for him. For as the Church is a most ample and most vniuersall Monarchie, and therefore according to *Suarez* his second reason, needeth more spirituall Princes and Bishops, then a Kingdome doth neede tempor all Princes: so euerie notable parte of this vniuersall and ample Church, pleadeth for one *Ordinarie* or *Delegate* Bishop, one Bishop being not sufficient to serue diuers great partes thereof, as aboue is declared.

38. By this, sayeth M. Nicholas *num. 17. is answered a demaund of M. Doctour. Chapter 14. VV by the Pope and Bishops in the primatiue Church were so diligent in consecrating Bishops, yea and making Popes in the midst of persecution, but that they thought it was the diuine law, that euerie (great) Church should haue its Bishop?* M. Nicholas answereth, *that the reason*

was, because in those times euerie Countrie needed itt owne Bishop, to ordaine Priests &c. And why might not Priests then haue beene sent out of one countrie into another, as well as now? Was anie one countrie so farre distant from all Catholike coũtries or Churches, as none could send Priests vnto them, as now they do from Rome, Spaine, Flãders and other places into England? And is not England separated from the whole worlde more thẽ many of those countries? Did not Apostolicall men then go further, and do they not now also?

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

In the numbers 19.20.21.22.23. he examineth the Examples of the Africans alledged by M. Doctour *Chap. 13. n. 7. 8. and he saieth, examples proue litle, vnlesse we were sure of all circumstances.*

THE REPLY.

Why these examples were alledged by M. Doctour: *and what they proue.*

39. *M. Doctour* brought these examples, as he doth professe in his 13. *Chapter. num. 7.* to shewe their zele, and great desire to haue a Bishop notwithstanding persecution; and so *M. Nicholas* may let them stand, as they will, to all posteritie. If all English Catholikes and especiallie some Regular Catholikes and their adherentes, had imitated this zele, those oppositions against a Bishop sent by lawfull and higheſt authoritie would neuer haue beene, but rather we should haue all ioyned vnanimouslie for the procuring

of

of a Bishop, not for priuate interests (of which *M. Nicholas*, though he inculcate it sometimes, had as much need to take heed of, as Secular Priests, who, cõsidering the times, haue litle reason to desire such an office for humane respects, to which many labours and daungers, no wordly splendour or riches are now annexed) but for the good of our countrie, the comfort of Catholikes, the saluation of soules, the honour of our Church of England, and the greater glorie of God. Yet these examples of those zelous African Catholikes proue also something. For why should they so crye for a Bishop, but that they knew it was the diuine Institution, that the Church in all times should be gouerned by Bishops, but that they reaped great comforte, and had much direction in persecution by his presence, and great strength by the grace of Confirmation, which for twentie fower yeares they had wanted; they hauing had all that time no Bishop.

Victor Vticns. l. 2 de persec. Vãdal.

40. And thus *M. Nicholas* his third question being fullie answered, though he peraduenture, not satisfied, *M. Doctours* position of the necessitie of a Bishop in euerie notable parte of the Church proued, and all *M. Nicholas* hath beene able to say disproued, I will make an end of this question.

THE FOVRTH QVESTION.

VVhether a countrie although the perſecution should be encreaſed by occaſion of hauing a Biſhop, could refuſe one, if it were onely for the Sacrament of Confirmation.

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

FIRST *we proteſt that by Gods holy aſſiſtance, we do, and euer will reuerence the Sacrament of Confirmation &c. but to put vpon mennes Conſciences ſo ſtrict an obligation notwithſtanding whatſoeuer perſecution &c* num. 1.

THE REPLIE.

M. Nicholas *changeth the Queſtion.*

1. M. DOCTOVR onely affirmeth that as although no man in particular be bound to receiue a Prieſt, if thereby he should hazard

hazard lands, libertie or life: Yet no countrie can except againſt the comming in of Prieſts, for feare of perſecution in generall; becauſe the loſſe of preaching and Sacraments &c. is ſuch a ſpirituall domage to a whole countrie, that it ſhould rather hazard perſecution, then refuſe Prieſts, though none in particular be bound with ſuch temporall loſſe to receiue a prieſt, his priuate ſpirituall loſſe being not cõparable to the ſpirituall loſſe, which a whole countrie ſhould receiue by want of Prieſts: So *M. Doctour* ſayeth alſo, that although no man in particular be bound to receiue a Biſhop into his houſe, or Confirmation of him, with any notable temporall loſſe: Yet neither a whole countrie, nor any of the countrie can except againſt the comming in of a Biſhop; by reaſon that the ſpirituall loſſe, which it ſhould ſuſtaine by want of him: for that the Countrie ſhould not be a particular Church, nor the Catholikes could be perfect Chriſtians, nor could they haue ſo infalliblie the grace of Cõfirmation giuen to that purpoſe, that men may haue force thereby to ſtand conſtantly to the profeſſion of their faith; nor ſhould they haue the example and encouragement of the Biſhop, who in that caſe vſeth to put life into his ſubiectes.

2. *M. Nicholas* changeth the ſtate of the queſtion, and impoſeth on *M. Doctour*, as though he ſayed, that euerie Catholike in particular is bound to hazard all for the Biſhop, and Confirmation.

3. That *M. Doctour* ſpeaketh onely in generall, may appeare by thoſe his words, which he hath *Chapter* 14. *numer.* 3. 4. & 8. and alſo by the words, which out of *Maiſter Doctour*, *Maiſter Nicholas* himſelfe alledgeth *q.* 4. *num.* 12. Where *M. Doctour* ſayeth: *I am of opinion (which I humblie ſubmitte to authoritie) that the particular Church*, of England, France, Spaine and ſuch like (of which notable partes he before ſpoake *n.* 2.) *cannot except any long tyme againſt a Biſhop.* Againe *M. Doctour* ſayeth in the ſame *Chapter nu.* 8. *But howſoeuer although euerie man in particular cannot be condemned of ſinne for omitting confirmation for feare of loſſe of his life, lands or libertie: yet I thinke &c.* Which words *M. Nicholas* alledgeth out of *M. Doctour p.* 85.

4. And yet that *M. Nicholas* in the beginning of this 4. *queſtion*, chargeth *M. Doctour* as though he had ſayed, that euerie one in particular is to hazard temporall loſſes, rather then to omit confirmatiõ: appeareth, becauſe he exaggerateth, this as if he had put *vpon mens conſciences ſo ſtrict an obligation, notwithſtanding whatſoeuer perſecution &c.* And againe *pag* 83. endeauouring to anſwere a place alledged out of S. Clement, he ſayeth, our *caſe is when Confirmatiõ cannot be had without hazard of goods, libertie*, & life; as though *M. Doctour* had ſayed that one in particular is to hazard ſuch loſſe rather then omit Confirmation.

5. But *M. Doctour* ſpeaketh in generall: and if becauſe in particular no man is bound to hazard any notable temporall loſſe for the Biſhop, or Confir-

Confirmation, he may inferre that the countrie may except againſt the Bishop and that Sacrament; by the like reaſon it may be inferred, that becauſe no man is bound to receiue a prieſt ſecular or regular into his houſe, or to receiue any Sacrament of him, or to heare his ſermon with hazard of loſſe of goods, libertie or life, he may except againſt the comming in of Secular and Regular Prieſts. For though there be not the like neceſſitie of a Bishop & Prieſts in all pointes, yet if one argument concludeth, the other muſt conclude: eſpeciallie in *M. Nicholas* his opinion who ſayeth in this *queſtion num. 17. that the generall perſecution of a whole countrie is more to be auoided thē of any priuate perſon. VV ho yet, as* M. Doctour *confeſſeth, is not obliged to hazard goods or life, for enioying the Sacrament of Confirmation*: by which it ſeemeth he would inferre, that if a priuat perſon be not bound to hazard loſſe of goods or life for Cō-firmation, neither is a countrie whence it followeth in *M. Nicholas* his manner of arguing, that if a priuat perſon be not bound to receiue a Prieſt with that hazard, a countrie is not bound to receiue Prieſts into it with hazard of perſecution. But the generall ſpirituall loſſe is greater thē anie particular loſſe as *M. Nicholas* confeſſeth and ſo more is to be hazarded, rather then a whole coū-trie should want a Bishop or Prieſtes, then that a priuat man should want them.

5. But *M. Nicholas* in the beginning of this queſtion, fearing be like that he might ſeeme no

good

good Catholike in writing against the necessitie of the Bishop, and Confirmation; protesteth *that he reuerenceth Confirmation, and that when Confirmation can conuenientlie be had* (and when is it more necessarie then in time of persecution, against which it is instituted? When is it more necessarie that the souldier should be armed and haue his Captaine then when the enemie is readie to giue battaile?) *the neglect of so great a benefit cannot be pleasing to God.* Which protestation was indeed necessarie, and I feare is not sufficient: for that hereafter Puritans may alledge him against Bishops and Confirmation, the necessitie of which he so much extenuateth.

M. NICHOLAS.

True it is the Sacrament of Confirmation *was instituted for giuing of grace to professe our faith, and* S. Thomas *teacheth that by it a man receiueth augmentation and groweth &c.* numer. 2.

THE REPLY.

Whether according to S. Thomas *without* Confirmation *wee can be* perfect Christians.

M. Doctour in his 14. *Chapter n.* 5. *pag.* 180. being to proue that a particular Countrie, cannot refuse a Bishop by reason of persecution, alledgeth two reasons. The first is, because the gouernemēt of Bishops in the Church, is instituted by Christ, as he had proued in the former *Chapter.* The second reason is *n.* 2. because the commoditie which a prouince reapeth by a Bishop is so greate, and the

the want of him is ſuch a loſſe, that we ſhould rather hazard perſecution, then to be depriued of a Bishop. For firſt without a Bishop we cannot be perfect Chriſtians &c. then *n.* 4. Secondlie, *the Sacrament of Confirmation* pleadeth for a Bishop. Then *n.* 9. without a Bishop we can be no particular Church &c. Then *n.* 10. Without a Bishop no Hierarchicall action can be exerciſed in the Church. So that *M. Doctours* ſecond reaſon includeth fowre reaſons all which make one totall reaſon. *M. Nicholas* beginneth with that parte of the totall ſecond reaſon, which was, becauſe without a Bishop, we cannot be perfect Chriſtiās. Wherein he playeth foule playe, in taking theſe reaſons a parte; becauſe *virtus vnita eſt fortior ſeipſa diſperſa*; and a child will breake a sheffe of arrowes one by one, which ioyned in one boundell he cannot; and many vnited can draw a ship, which ſeuered they cannot; and ſo all *M. Doctours* partiall reaſons put together may make one good and conuincing reaſon, though ſeuerallie taken they could not.

7. But let vs ſee how he anſwereth this partiall reaſon ſingled out from the reſt. M. *Doctour* had alledged S. *Thomas* of *Aquin* who compareth *Baptiſme* to our natiuitie, by which we haue our firſt being, and *Confirmation* to our augmentation and encreaſe, by which we get ſtrēgth & grougth. To our natiuitie (ſayeth this learned Doctour) is anſwerable, in a ſpirituall life, *Baptiſme*, by which we are regenerated, and receaue our firſt ſpiri- *S. Th. 3 p. q. 65, ar. 1.*

tuall

Ioan.3. tuall being. To our augmentation and grougth
Tit 3. (ſayeth he) is anſwerable *Confirmation*, by which the holy ghoſt is giuen to giue vs manlie pitch
Luc. vlt. and ſtrength; according to that: *And I ſend the promes of my father vpon you: But you, tarrie in the Citie, till you be endued with powre from high.* And againe. *But you ſhall receaue the vertue of the holie*
Act. 1. *Ghoſt comming vpon you.* So that according to *S. Thomas* by *Baptiſme* we are borne Chriſtians, but
1. Pet. 2. litle ones, and to vſe *S. Peters* words, *as infants euen now borne*: and by *Confirmation* me receaue manly grougth: for as our natiuitie giueth vs our being, and all our partes, and limmes, but all litle and weake, and our augmentation giueth vs full ſtrength and quantitie in all the bodie, and maketh vs men; ſo by *Baptiſme*, wee haue our ſpirituall birth, and wee are Chriſtians, but weake, and infirme, and by *Confirmation* we receaue full grougth and ſtrength, and we become perfect Chriſtians.

8. Whereby it is euident that *S. Thomas*, though a greate Sainte, and a greate diuine, ſayeth as much as *M. Doctour* doth. Yea what *M. Doctour* ſayeth, he ſpeaketh out of his mouth: and none write againſt *S. Thomas* for ſaying ſo, as *M. Nicholas* hath written againſt *M. Doctour*. Yet let vs heare *M. Nicholas* his anſwere; *True it is* (ſayeth he) *that* S. *Thomas teacheth that by it* (Confirmation) *a man receiueth augmentation and groweth: which yet cannot be ſo vnderſtood, as if this Sacrament were the onelie meanes to attaine ſuch ſpirituall groweth.*

groweth. And why? *because* (sayeth he) *by other Sacraments, and ordinarie helpes of almightie, God we may receaue the effect of that same grace, which is giuē men in Confirmation.* I cannot like this his answere, if it were but for this, that it in a manner giueth Christians occasion to neglect this, and other Sacraments, seing that by other meanes, as the loue of God, Contrition, prayer, meditation & c. they may get as much grace, as is giuen by Sacramēts. But suppose that by other Sacraments and other meanes one may get as much grace, as *Confirmation* giueth: yet he should not soe easilie nor soe infalliblie get it: nor should he Sacramentallie, and by a Character be a perfect Christian.

9. For as although a *Cathecumene* who beleiueth all that other Christians do, may peraduenture by multiplication of actes of Charitie and contrition, by prayer, almes, faste, get as much grace as is gotten by *Baptisme*, yet he shall not be a Christian Sacramentallie, and by *Baptisme*, nor shall he be so incorporated to the Church, as the Church shall haue that authoritie ouer him, which she hath ouer the baptized; and therefore cannot bynde him to any Ecclesiasticall law, nor excommunicate him, he being, as *S. Paule* sayeth *foris*, *without*, and no actuall member of the Church: So though one might get more grace by other workes then by *Confirmation*, yet he should be no more Sacramentallie and by character a perfect Christian, then a *Cathecumen* vnbaptized, should be a Christian, and

1. Cor. 5.

so

S.Tho. 2 2 q. 184. ar.3.ad 3. so although (as *M. Nicholas* sayeth *n.*4. out of *S. Thomas*) by obseruing the counsailes, as religious men do; a man may haue greater perfection, then other Christians haue, yet that will not make him a perfect Christian in *S. Thomas* his meaning. For as a man may haue as much strength and skill in fencing and fighting, as the best soldiour, yet till he be admitted and doth receaue his militarie liuerie, hee is not a soldiour by profession: So a Christian may peraduenture haue as much grace as one that is confirmed, but till he be confirmed, he shall not be an enroulled spirituall soldiour, nor a perfect Christian.

10. And although a man may haue grace without this Sacrament to professe his faith, and to suffer death for it, as many in England not cõfirmed haue done, and as *M. Doctour* graunteth in *his Epistle dedicatorie n.*18. and in his booke *pagin.* 384. *n.* 7. Yet that grace was merelie gratuitely and freelie bestowed, and is not so infalliblie giue without *Confirmation*, as by it; because to the confirmed that grace is due by reason of the Sacrament and Character, which they haue receiued, God by promise and couenant obliging himselfe to giue the speciall grace of the Sacrament to them that receaue it. And they that write against this Sacrament, or they that neglect it when they may haue it without any imminent or certaine daunger (for I do not heare that any haue beene particularlie persecuted for hauing beene confirmed, though thousands haue beene cõfirmed) may feare lest they may be denyed this speciall

grace, as neglecting the ordinarie meanes to get it, which is *Confirmation*. To that he sayeth *n.* 3. 4. 5. he may gather his answere by what is sayed: To that he alledgeth *n.* 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14 he is partelie answered, partelie shalbe anone. For *M. Doctour* sayeth onely that a Countrie, for feare of persecution, cannot except against a Bishop or Confirmation; Whereas *M. Nicholas* would make *M. Doctour* say, that euery particular man is boũd to suffer persecution, rather then not admit a Bishop or Confirmation; and *M. Doctour* by a Bishop meaneth him, who hath Episcopall authoritie to giue Confirmation: *M. Nicholas* would haue him meane an *Ordinarie*, though I know *M. Nicholas* for his parte desireth no *Ordinarie*.

M. NICHOLAS.

Then he alledgeth S. Clement *ep.* 4. *saying*, omnibus ergo festinandum est sine mora renasci Deo, & demum consignari ab Episcopo &c. *but first* M. Doctour *should not haue grounded so hard a doctrine vpon an Epistle which I suppose he knoweth not to be so authenticall &c. n.* 15. *&* 16.

THE REPLY.

S. Clements *Testimonie that without* Confirmation *one is not* a perfect Christian, *is defended, and* M. Nicholas *his answeres plainely refuted.*

11. *M. Nicholas* sayeth *M. Doctour should not haue grounded so hard a doctrine vpon an Epistle do not so authenticall, as thereon to settle a doctrinall pointe as he may see in Bellarmine.* I note heare first that *M. Nicholas* counteth it an *hard doctrine*, Rhem. Test. Bel. de Script. Eccl.

to say

to say that one is not a *perfect Christian* without *Confirmation*. And yet *S. Thomas*, as we haue seene! *S. Clement* already alledged: *S. Vrban*, *S. Cyprian*, and other Fathers yea and Diuines; whome I shall adde after *S. Clement*, do affirme, and heretikes onely deny it, with whome *M. Nicholas* ioyneth in this point.

S. Tho. 3 p. q. 65. ar. 1. Vrban ep. decretals

Cal. l 9 Instit. c. 19 n. 9.

11. Let vs heare *Caluin* speake. These are his words: *Addunt præterea fideles omnes Spiritum sanctum per manuum impositionem accipere debere post Baptismum, vt pleni Christiani inueniantur.* They (Catholikes) *adde also that all the faithfull must receiue the holie Ghost by impositon of hands after Baptisme, that they may be found full Christians*: which *Caluin* in his next words condemneth with *M. Nicholas*, who sayeth it is an hard doctrine. And *Bellarmin. To. 2. l. 2. de effectu Sacramentorum cap. 29.* sayeth that *S. Cyprian l. 2. ep. 1.* & *S. Cornelius* Pope *ep. ad Fabianum apud Eusebium l. 6. hist. c. 53. feare not to say that they are not fullie sanctified, nor perfect Christians who want the Sacrament of Chrisme, although Caluin and Kemnitius call this word an ould calumnie.* But see how disaffection can transporte euen a Catholike and a Religious man. Because for sooth he would haue no Bishop in England, he would not haue *Confirmatiõ* necessarie to make a perfect Church or perfect Christiãs; and therefore sayeth against the ancient Fathers, and all diuines, euen Iesuites, that treate of this matter, that a man may be a *perfect Christian*, without *Confirmation*; yea that it *is an hard doctrine to say that*

without

Without Confirmation wee cannot be perfect Christians. He vrgeth censures against *M. Doctour*, where no censure, but good, can be giuen, as I partlie haue and partlie shall shewe. But if this *M. Nicholas* his proposition: *It is an hard doctrine to saye that without confirmation we cannot be perfect Christians*, were proposed to superiours I feare it would be hardly censured, it being against ancient Fathers, and the common opinion of Diuines, and onely being applauded by *Caluin* and other heretikes, who, because they deney *Cõfirmation*, cānot abide to heare what the Fathers say, to wit, that it *perfecteth Baptisme*, and maketh vs *perfect Christians*. And therefore *Caluin* saieth, lib. 4. Inst. c. 19. n. 8. *Adeò nihil eos pudet vt negent Baptismum ritè sine Confirmatione perfici posse. They are so shameleſſe, as that they deney Baptisme to be rightlie perfected without Confirmation.* Theſe Fathers, and diuines I shall alledge after *S. Clement.*

12. Secondlie here I obserue *M. Nicholas* his boldeneſſe in daring to reiect *S. Clements* epiſtles, and in particular the 4. Epiſtle alledged by *M. Doctour*, it being alledged to proue Confirmation a Sacrament, by *Coccius tom. 2. lib. 3. ar. 20. Suarez 3. p. tom. 3 disp 32. art. 1. Coninckę, 3. p. qu. 72. art. 1. Bellarmin, l. 1. de Confirm. c. 3. Eſti in 4. d. 7. §. 13. the Catechiſme ad Parochos, Confirm. Sacram. Bains l. 2. de Inſtit. c. 6. Valentia in Controu. lib. de numero Sacramentorum cap. 1.* obiecteth against decretall Epiſtles as *M. Nicholas* doth against *S. Clements epiſtles* which are parte of them; *illas epiſtolas decretales Põtificum*

Cocc. Suarez Conin. Bellar. Eſtius. Cath. Bains. Valentia.

tificum esse suppositias: that these decretall Epistles of the Popes are Coũterfaite: Gregorie of *Valẽtia* a Iesuite answereth. *Sed defensionem earum Epistolarum suscepit Franciscus Turrianus in lib. quem pro illis aduersus Magdeburgenses Cẽturiatores eruditissimè conscripsit: qui hactenus illi non responderunt, neque satis vnquam respondere poterunt. But a defense of those Epistles Franciscus Turrianus* (a Iesuite also) *hath vndertaken in a booke, which for those Epistles he wrote most learnedlie against the Magdeburgian Centurians: who haue not hitherto made any answere to it, neither shall they euer be able to answere sufficientlie* And so *M. Nicholas* against all these (as well as against *M. Doctour*) who alledge this place to proue *Confirmation* a Sacramẽt, might haue said, *that they should not haue grounded the veritie of a Sacrament* (so much impugned by heretikes) *vpon an Epistle, which (as it is to be supposed) they knew not to be so Authenticall as to settle thereon a doctrinall point*, yea a matter of faith. Did not they know, as well as *M. Nicholas* how Authenticall *Saint Clements workes were?*

13. But sayeth *M. Nicholas, Bellarmine* in his booke *de Scriptoribus Eccles.* Sayeth, that the Epistles of *S. Clement* are not Authenticall: And I graunt that *Bellarmine* sayeth that the *Epistles* (of S. Clement) *which now are extant, want not a* ſ*ouple*, by reason that there are many thinges inserted, as that two Epistles were written to *Saint Iames* who was dead before. But, sayeth *Bellarmine*, perchaunce they were written to *S. Simeon*;

Lib. de Script. Eccles. in Clement.

and

and other thinges there are (ſayeth he) which peraduenture were inſerted, and are not in the Vatican booke. But yet he reiecteth not this Epiſtle, and therefore (as we haue ſeene) hee and many others do cite this Epiſtle, and in the Canon law S. *Clemẽts* Epiſtles, and other his workes, are alledged; and *Turrianus*, *Gualterus*, and many others doe defend theſe workes, and Catholike writers alledge them againſt heretikes, whom *M. Nicholas* muſt take heed leaſt he fauour in ſo ſlighting the authoritie of theſe Epiſtles. *Diſt. 40 c. In illis & 16 q. 1. capit. Cunctis.*

14. If this anſwere in which he denyeth S. *Clements* Epiſtles to be of authoritie pleaſe not, *M. Nicholas* hath another *n.* 16. Which he taketh out of *Eſtius* whom he ſayeth *M. Doctour* cited for the neceſſitie of *Confirmation*, but did not cite his explication of Fathers how they ſay that one is not a perfect Chriſtian without Confirmation: which, ſayeth *M. Nicholas*, is no faire dealing. But why was it no fayre dealing for *M. Doctour* to cite *Eſtius* for the neceſſitie of *Confirmation*? Suppoſe in the other point he had beene againſt *M. Doctour*? do not Diuines commonlie alledge a father or Diuine for the pointe wherein he fauoureth them? And are they bound to alledge him in another matter, wherein hee ſeemes to be againſt them? And ſo if *Eſtius* had beene againſt *M. Doctour* and had ſayed *that without Confirmation a man might be a perfect Chriſtian*, he might yet haue cited him for the neceſſitie of *Confirmation*, without citing him for the point of *a perfect Chriſtian*. Elſe how

could *Maiſter Nicholas* cite *Eſtius* for this point, ſeing that in another point he holdeth againſt *M. Nicholas*, that a Prieſt not conſecrated Bishop, cannot confirme by any commiſſion of the Pope as we ſee aboue q.1.n. But *Eſtius* his doctrine of *a perfect Chriſtian*, is not againſt *M. Doctour* and ſo was not by him left out for that cauſe: but ether becauſe he is not ſo cleare in that point as others, or becauſe *M Doctour* had cited S *clement* whoſe words were plaine. But let vs heare *Eſtius*: theſe be his words in English: *It muſt be obſerued, that the Fathers in ſuch ſentences* (where they ſay that men cannot be perfect Chriſtians vnleſſe they be confirmed) *doe allude to the name of Chriſt, which ſignifieth anointed. Wherevpon they deney that they are fullie Chriſtians, who as yet haue not receiued Epiſcopall vnction, making force in the word Chriſtian.* Which his manner of explication may verie well fauour the explication aboue giuen, by which it was ſayed that although a man may perchaunce by other meanes get as much grace as confirmation giueth; yet he is not a perfect Chriſtian, becauſe he hath not the Sacrament of perfection, which is the *Epiſcopall Vnction.*

Eſtius in 4. diſt 7. § 9.

15. But our aduerſarie fearing perhappes not to be fortunate enough in theſe two anſweres, addeth a third *p.* 81. He telleth vs that the ancient practiſe was to giue together with Baptiſme, the Sacrament of *Confirmation*, and that therefore *S. Clement* his meaning is onely this; that they who haue

haue not both theſe Sacraments (for one was not giuen without the other) are not perfect Chriſtians, and ſayeth he, *I doubt not but that this will fullie ſatisfie the learned Reader.*

16. But this anſwere argueth onelie the hard ſhiftes, to which *M. Nicholas* is put: for elſe, what diuine, yea Catechumen who knoweth his Catechiſme, would haue giuen ſuch an anſwere? For who knoweth not, that it is one thing to be a Chriſtian, another thing to be a perfect Chriſtiã, and how that goeth before, this commeth after; that *Baptiſme* onelie maketh a Chriſtian, *Confirmation* a perfect Chriſtian; and he that wanteth both is no Chriſtian at all? And therefore *S. Clement* could not haue ſaied of him that wanteth both, that he is no perfect Chriſtian, but rather he ſhould haue ſayed, that he is noe Chriſtian at all. For that a perfect Chriſtian ſuppoſeth a Chriſtian, and he that wanteth baptiſme, is no Chriſtian, and ſo cannot be called an imperfect Chriſtian, he being no Chriſtianiſtiall at all.

17. Wherefore *S. Clement* to ſhew that he ſpeaketh not of both Sacramẽts when he ſayeth that *one cannot be a perfect Chriſtian*; diſtinguiſheth the effectes of both theſe two Sacraments, and therefore ſayeth: *all muſt make haſte to be regenerated without delay*: behould the effect of Baptiſme, *regeneration. And then at length*, that is, after Baptiſme, *to be conſigned of the Bishop, that is, to receiue the ſeuenfould grace of the holie Ghoſt*. See the effect of Confirmation, to wit, ſeuenfould grace; And

then he addeth: *And when he shalbe regenerated by water*, See the effect of Baptisme, *regeneration: and afterwardes, as is mentioned, confirmed of a Bishop by the seuenfould grace of the Spirit*, see the effect of Confirmation: *quia aliàs perfectus esse Christianus nequaquam potest: for otherwise* (that is vnlesse he be Consigned and confirmed) *he cannot be a perfect Christian.* Where *otherwise*, hath a reference onelie to *Confirmation* of which he spoke last: for if it had reference to both Sacraments (as *M. Nicholas* sayed) S. *Clement* should haue sayed, he can be no Christian at all, because he that is not baptized is not at all a Christian, and so cannot be called an imperfect Christian.

18. And to confront *M. Nicholas* the more (for I see by experience, he will not he Satisfied with a litle) let vs heare *Cardinall Bellarmine*: He, after he had cited those words of *S. Clement*: *All must make haste without delay to be regenerated, and then to be consigned of the Bishop and receiue the seuenfould grace of the holie Ghost*: addeth: *Et infra causam reddit* (Clemens) *quia non potest aliquis sine eo Sacramento esse perfectus Christianus*: and after he (Clemēt) giueth the reasō, *because without that Sacrament* (Confirmatiō) *one cannot be a perfect Christian.* Where the Reader must note, that *Cardinall Bellarmine* sayeth not (as *M. Nicholas* doth) that without both Sacraments, *but without that Sacrament*, to wit, of *Confirmation*, *one cannot be a perfect Christian.* And so without *Confirmation*, according to *S. Clement* one cānot be a *perfect Christian.*

Bel. l. 1. de Cō firm. c 3.

19. But

19. But as they who haue neuer a good anſwere are forced to vſe many, whereas one good anſwere alwayes ſatisfieth; ſo *M. Nicholas* knowing belike that none of his anſwers will abide the touchſtone, nor ſtand the examination, bringeth many anſweres, not ſo much to ſatisfie vs, as to praſe vs with the multitude. He therefore hath in ſtore for vs a fourth anſwere: and what is that? He ſayeth *pag.* 83. that *S. Clement is not faithfullie alledged by M. Doctour.* And why? becauſe he alledgeth not all his words, but ends at theſe words before alledged; *otherwiſe he cannot be a perfect Chriſtian.* And what needed *M. Doctour* alledge anie more words, ſeing he had alledged thoſe that proued what he intended, to wit, that *without confirmation one cannot be a perfect Chriſtian?* And truely M. *Doctour* alledged more of *S. Clements* words then *Cardinall Bellarmine* in the place aboue cited did; and yet Bellarmine who ſaw thoſe words that follow, as well as M. *Nicholas*, without alledging them, feared not to ſay: *Et infra cauſam reddit* (Clemens) *quia non poteſt aliquis ſine eo Sacramento eſſe perfectus Chriſtianus: and after he* (S. Clement) *yeeldeth the reaſon, becauſe one cannot without that Sacrament be a perfect Chriſtian.*

20. But what are theſe words, which M. *Doctour* left out. Let vs heare them from M. *Nicholas* his owne mouth. *My 4. anſwere is that* S. Clemẽt *is not faithfullie alledged by* M. Doctour, *for* S. Clement *after he had ſayed: When he ſhalbe regenerated and by water afterward confirmed by the Bishop with*

the ſeuenfould grace of the Spirit, becauſe otherwiſe he cannot be a perfect Chriſtian (*where M. Doctour ends with an &c.*) *immediatelie addeth words wherein the verie point in queſtion conſiſteth ſaying: ſi non neceſſitate ſed incuriâ ſic, aut voluntate remanſerit: If he ſhall remaine ſo not by neceſſitie, but by careleſſeneſſe or voluntarilie.* But firſt here I might (if I were as foreward in carping at leauing out words, though not to the purpoſe, as *M. Nicholas* is) obſerue the like fault in him euen in this place in which he taxeth *Maiſter Doctour*, for that he omitteth thoſe words: *nec ſedem habere inter perfectos: nor haue place amongſt the perfect*, which are the immediate words that go before thoſe, which *M. Nicholas* ſayeth *M. Doctour* lift out, to wit; *If he ſhall remaine ſo not of neceſſitie.* And *M. Doctour* hath indeed cauſe to thinke *M. Nicholas* left them out of purpoſe: for that, as wee ſhall ſee, they made againſt him and for *M. Doctour.*

21. Yet let vs heare how *M. Nicholas* argueth out of theſe words, which not onely *M Doctour*, but alſo *Bellarmin* left out, as alſo others aboue cited do. *S. Clement* (ſayeth he *pag.* 83.) ſayeth, that he who after Baptiſme is not Confirmed, cannot be a perfect Chriſtian if he want it out of careleſſeneſſe, not out of neceſſitie, *ergo* ſayeth he, the Catholikes of England, who want it out of neceſſitie may be perfect Chriſtians without it; but what neceſſitie is there now, or hath there bene ſince the Pope ſent our two laſt moſt Reuerend Bishops, to want *Confirmation*? For we haue,

thankes

thankes be to God, a Bishop willing to giue that Sacrament, and there is no ſpeciall law againſt him, and neuer any as yet hath bene perſecuted for hauing taken it, *Confirmation*, at leaſt the perſecution is not ſo great, but that thouſandes haue taken it. And theſe words which *M. Doctour* left out, as they are ſome what obſcure, ſo they are as much againſt *M. Nicholas*, as *M. Doctour*.

22. For firſt he ſayeth out of *Eſtius*, that when *S. Clement* or other Fathers ſaye, that a man cannot be a perfect Chriſtian without *Confirmation*, they ſay ſo, becauſe till he haue it, he hath not the perfect vnction, of which wee are called Chriſtians, that is, anointed. And then will I adde theſe words in which *M. Nicholas* ſayeth the point of the controuerſie conſiſteth, *if not by neceſſitie, but by careleſſeneſſe, or voluntarilie, he ſhall remaine ſo*: *ergo* if not by careleſſeſſe, but out of neceſſitie he want *Confirmation*, he may he a perfect Chriſtian, that is, perfectlie anointed without it; which were to ſay, he may be perfectlie anointed without perfect vnction, and ſo haue it without hauing it.

23. Secondlie his third anſwere to *S. Clements* words *pag.* 81. (as aboue we haue ſeene) was, that the ancient practiſe was to giue *baptiſme* and *Confirmation* together: and that therefore when *S. Clement* ſayeth, *that otherwiſe he cannot be a perfect Chriſtian*; he meaneth that vnleſſe he haue both Sacraments, that is, *Baptiſme* and *Confirmation*, *he cannot be a perfect Chriſtian*: and then will I come

vpon

M. Nicholas with thoſe words following, *if he ſhall remaine ſo, not by neceſsitie, but by careleſſeneſſe or voluntarilie: Ergo* if by neceſſitie, he want both *Baptiſme* and *Confirmation* he may be a perfect Chriſtian: and yet without *Baptiſme* he is no Chriſtian at all, and conſequentlie no perfect Chriſtian. Wherefore vnleſſe we will make *S. Clement* abſurdlie contradict himſelfe, and make all Diuines allmoſt abſurd, who alledge, (as *Suarez* alſo alledgeth) theſe laſt words, which *M. Doctour* omitted, as not neceſſarie to his purpoſe, we muſt ſay that *S. Clement* meaneth not to ſay, as *M. Nicholas* inferreth, that if of neceſſitie one want *Confirmation*, he may be a perfect Chriſtian without it: for that were to contradict himſelfe, he hauing ſayed before, that vnleſſe one be conſigned, he cannot be a perfect Chriſtian. And ſo whether he want *Confirmation* voluntarilie or of neceſſitie, he cannot be a perfect Chriſtian Sacramentallie as aboue is ſayed; as whether voluntarilie or by neceſſitie he want Baptiſme, he is no Chriſtian. Wherefore the ſenſe of theſe words muſt not be, that which *M. Nicholas* gathereth, but ſome other, and as it is verie probable, it is this ſenſe following, which is gathered out of the words which *M Nicholas* left out, which are thoſe, *nor haue place amongſt the perfect, if he remaine ſo, not by neceſsitie* &c.

Suarez Supra.

24. This then is the ſenſe of S *Clements* words. *All therefore muſt make haſte without delay to be regenerated to God, and then to be conſigned by the Biſhop,*

that

that is, to receiue the ſeuenfould grace of the holy Ghoſt, becauſe the end of euerie ones life is vncertaine (which he may ſay, becauſe Baptiſme and Confirmation then were giuen together, and ſo Baptiſme at leaſt was not to be delayed leaſt one should dye without Baptiſme) and when *he shalbe regenerated by water, and afterward confirmed by the Bishop with the ſeuenfould grace of the ſpirit* (*as is memorated*) *for otherwiſe he cannot be a perfect Chriſtian, nor* (theſe words *M. Nicholas* left out) *haue place amongſt the perfect, if he ſo remaine not by neceſsitie but by careleſſeneſſe or voluntarilie.* Which laſt words cānot be referred to the words, *otherwiſe he cannot be a perfect Chriſtiā*, but to the words immediatlie following (which *M. Nicholas* left out) *to wit, nor haue place amongſt the perfect*: that is, he cannot be admitted to the ſacred Euchariſt, nor to the ranke of them that are admitted to it, *if not by neceſsitie, but by careleſſeneſſe, or voluntarilie he shall remaine ſo*. For if by neceſſitie the partie baptized wanted Confirmation (as when he was baptized, for ſome iuſt cauſe, in abſence of the Bishop who could not be gotten) then, not elſe, he might (being baptiſed) haue place amongſt the perfect, and be admitted with them to the Euchariſt. And this expoſition may be gathered out of S. Dionyſius Areopagita according to the Tranſlation ſet out at Colein *an.* 1536. *l. de Eccl. Hier. c. 2. in fine. Ipſe vero* (Hierarcha) *deificantiſsimo vnguento virum ſignans, participem manifeſtat de cætero ſacræ perfectiſsimæ Euchariſtiæ. He* (the Biſhop) *anointing the man with*

the

the most deifying ointment, manifesteth him partaker of the Sacred most perfect Eucharist. And *Vasquez* a learned Iesuite follo wing the Translation of Perionius, citeth these words: *Is, cum virum unguento, quod maximè diuinos efficit, inſigniuit, Eucharistiæ, quæ vim maximam habet perficiendæ ſanctitatis, participem eſſe pronunciat*: He (the Bishop) when he hath marked the mã with the oyle, which maketh most diuine, pronounceth him partaker of the Eucharist which hath greatest force to perfect sanctitie, Whence Vasquez gathereth, that when one was baptized, he was declared capable of the Eucharist, and that the Eucharist vsed to be giuen after Confirmation, yet he sayeth there was noe diuine precept to take Confirmation before the Eucharist, but onelie vse and custome; So that they who were confirmed, were declared capable of the Eucharist, and commonly did presently after receiue it, though there were no diuine precept. And if any out of carelesseneſſe neglected Confirmation (which then by custome was to be taken presentlie after Baptisme) he was not admitted to haue place amongst the perfect, that is, amongst them who were capable of the sacred Eucharist: but if after baptisme they could not be confirmed, and so of necessitie wanted Confirmation, then they might communicate (there being no diuine precept to receiue Confirmation before the Eucharist) and so haue place amongst the perfect, that is, the confirmed who were capable of the sacred Eucharist.

Vasq. to. 3. in 3 part. disp. 212. c. 2.

25. And

25. And thus it appeareth that *M. Doctour* hath not bene vnfortunate in alledging *S. Clement*, no more then *Bellarmine*, *Suarez*, *Coninck*, the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, and diuers others alledged, were; rather *M. Nicholas* hath bene vnfortunate: first in reiecting him, then in expounding him.

26. I adde to *S. Clement*, *S. Vrban* Pope, who liued about the yeare 220. Who hath words which should make *M. Nicholas* graunt, that one cannot be a perfect Christian without Confirmation, if he respect ether Antiquitie, Authoritie or sanctitie, he thus pronounceth: *Omnes fideles, per manus Episcoporum Impositionem, Spiritum Sanctum post Baptismum, accipere debent, vt pleni Christiani inueniantur. All the faithfull by the Imposition of hands of Bishops, must receiue the holy Ghost after Baptisme that they may be full* (perfect) *Christians. S. Cornelius* Pope and Martyr: sayeth: *He* (Nouatianus) *was not cõsummated by the seale of Chrisme and therefore could not deserue the holy Ghost. S. Cyprian* sayeth, Christians are then fullie sanctified, if they be borne of both Sacraments, to wit, baptisme & Confirmation. And againe he sayeth, that by Confirmation, which he calleth *our Lords seale*, they are *consummated*: And the Councel Eliberinũ sayeth, that the baptized, if he liue after, must be caried to the Bishop *that by impositiõ of hands he may be perfected*. *S. Ambrose* sayeth that after *the font* of baptisme the spirituall seale, remaineth *that perfectiõ may be made*, by which they insinuate that Confirmation maketh perfect Christians.

S. Vrban. ep. decretali.

Cornel ep. ad Fabianum apud Euseb. l. 6. c. 33.

Et Bell. supra. Cyp. 72. sen l. 2. ep. 1. Ep. 73. ad Iubaian. Concil. Eliber. can 38.

The

Ambr. l 3 de Sacra. c 2. Conc. Aurel. c. 3. de conſec. d 5. c. Ieiun. Bell. l. 2. de Suc effect. c. 28.

The Councell of Orleans ſaieth *one ſhall neuer be a Chriſtian* (that is a perfect Chriſtian) *vnleſſe he be chriſmed by the Epiſcopall Confirmation.*

17. Wherefore Bellar. feared not to ſay: *Cypr. l. 1. ep. 1. & Cornelius in ep. ad Fabianum apud Euſeb. l. 6. hiſt. c. 53. Non timuerunt dicere, non eſſe plenè ſanctificatos nec perfectos Chriſtianos qui carent Sacramento Chiſmatis, etiamſi hanc vocent Caluinus & Kemnitius veterem contumeliam: Cyprian and Cornelius feared not to ſay, that they are not fullie ſanctified nor perfect Chriſtians, who want the Sacrament of Chriſme: although Caluin and Kemnitius call this an old calumnie*; as *M. Nicholas* alſo condemneth the ſame ſpeach, and ſo in this ioyneth with heretikes. *Lorinus* a Ieſuite writing vpon the 8. Chatter of the actes ſayeth, *that Guilielmus Pariſienſis deplores worthilie the contempt of ſo greate a Sacrament* (Confirmation) *whoſe grace is in ſome manner greater then the grace of Baptiſme (and without which* (Sacrament) *as the Fathers and councells ſpeake, wee are not full, perfect, and conſummated Chriſtians. Wherefore* (he ſaieth) *this Sacrament is called* τελείωσις, *that is, conſummatio, conſummation:* *Bayus* alſo citeth *S. Clement* his conſtitutions & the epiſtle which *M. Doctour* alledged to proue that the Biſhop is the miniſter of Confirmation, and he giueth this reaſon, becauſe Cõfirmation is the perfection and complement of Baptiſme, and ſo muſt be miniſtered by the chiefe miniſter. And againe the ſame Authour citeth as *M. Doctour did S. Clement Epiſt. 4. Clemens epiſt. 4. ſic*

in c 8. Act v 17 lit H.

Bayus l. 2 inſt cap. 60 5 Cle. l. 3 cõſt. c. 10 16 17 & l. 7. c. 44 & ep. 4

De-

Demum à B. Petro accepisse refert, oportere renasci Deo l. 2. de
ac consignari ab Episcopo, vt perfecti efficiamur Constit.
Christiani: Clement in his 4. epistle sayeth that he c. 57.
had from S. Peter that we must be regenerated to God,
and then be consigned by the Bishop, that we may be
made perfect Christians. Wherefore *M. Nicholas* in
condemning *M. Doctour* for saying that without
Confirmation we cannot be perfect Christians,
and for alledging *S. Clement* to prooue, it con-
demneth the ancient Fathers & almost all Diuines
who say the same, and for it, alledge also *S. Cle-* In c. 19
ment. Maldonate a Iesuite also, obseruing that *Mar.* n.
the guift of miracles and tongues, and the visible 18. in
descent of the holie Ghost did not ordinarily, *fine.*
follow immediatelie Baptisme, but Confirma-
tion, sayeth: *quâ re aperte significabatur &c. by which*
thing it was signified plainely, that by Confirmation,
Baptisme was in some sorte perfected, which being
sayed by some Bishops of Rome (he citeth in the mar-
gent *Vrbanus* and *Melchiades*) *heretiks do not*
onely impudently, but also vnlearnedly laugh at it. And
Canisius also sayeth: *he is no perfect Christian* who
is not confirmed. And so *M. Nicholas* whilest he
condemneth *M. Doctour* for saying that without
Confirmation we are not perfect Christians, and
for alledging *S. Clement* for proofe of that he
sayed, condemneth also the ancient Fathers and
all Diuines who write of this matter; yea Iesuites
themselues; and so I cannot tell how hereafter
he can looke them in the face. Yea he fauoureth
Caluin as wee haue seene.

M.

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

M. Doctour *immediatelie after* S. Clement citeth S. Dionisius Areop. lib. de Eccles. Hierar. c. 5. *calling the Sacrament of* Confirmation *a perfecting Sacrament.* pag. 8. n. 17.

THE REPLY.

S. Denis *calleth the Sacrament of* Confirmation *a perfecting and consummating action.*

27. *M. Doctour* in calling the Sacrament of *Confirmation* a perfecting and consummating action: sayeth no more then *Card. Bellarmin* doth, who to proue *Confirmation* a Sacrament alledgeth some Greeke Fathers, and first S. *Denis* in these words: *perficiens illa vnctio facit perfectum: that perfecting vnction maketh perfect* and againe: *Sed & ipsis* &c. *But to them also who are consecrated by the most holy misterie of Regeneration, the consummating vnction of the ointment doth giue the comming of the holy Ghost.* Suarez also a learned Iesuite, and *Estius* and others doe attribute perfection and consummation to *Confirmation*, as *M. Doctour* did. Let vs heare *Estius* who *M. Nicholas* tooke for his friend in explicating how the Fathers say, that without *Confirmation* we cannot be perfect Christians. He saieth, that the *proper effect* of this Sacrament, *is robur Spiritus sancti, id est Gratia &c. the strength of the holy Ghost, that is, a grace by meanes of which the mynd of a* Christian *confirmed and corroborated by the holy Ghost, may persist and resist impugners* Hee addeth: *Hinc apud veteres &c. Hence, in the ancient fathers in many places wee read, that perfection, consummation,*

Dion. l. de Eccl. Hier. c. 2 p. 3. C 4. p. 3.

Suarez 3 p q. 72 a. 1. disp 32 sect. 1.

Estius in 4. d. 7 § 19

ſumation, Confirmation, augmentatiõ, conſtãcie, ſtrẽgth, fortitude, are giuen to this Sacrament, as effectes thereof. And for this he alleadgeth *S. Dionyſius*, *S. Clement* euen in the place aboue alleadge by *M. Doctour*, and ſayeth that *S. Clement* ſayeth, *one cannot be a perfect Chriſtian without it:* and citeth to this end *S. Fabian* Pope, *S. Cornelius*, *S. Melchiades* and others. And this *M. Nicholas* would not ſee nor acknowledge for feare leaſt thence might be inferred, that without Confirmation one cannot be a perfect Chriſtian: onely hee could eſpy. *cap.* 5. for *c.* 4. which fault (if he had bene corrector of the print) might haue bene preuented.

Dion. l Eccl. Hier c. 4. p. 3. Clem. l. 3 cõſ. Apoſt. c. 17 & epiſt 4 Fabia. ep 2. ad ep. orien. Corn. apud Euſeb. l. 6. c. 35 Melch. ep. ad epiſt. Hiſp. Dyon. Carth. in Elucidat c 4 in initio. ar 8.

28. Whereas *M. Nicholas* ſayeth that *S. Denys* in that 4. chapter *ſpeaketh of Baptiſme; and ſome tymes generallie of oyle and Vnction vſed not onely in diuers Sacraments, but alſo in Conſecration of Altars*, as though, in that Chapter he ſpake not of Confirmatiõ. *Dionyſius Carthuſianus* ſtandeth againſt him in the verie beginning of his Elucidation of that 4. Chapter, ſaying. *Poſtquam præhabito immediatè capitulo &c. after that* (by S. Denys) *it hath bene treated in the immediate aforeſayed Chapter, of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, of the celebration, rites or Hierarchicall Actes about it, here* (in the 4. Chapter) *the ſame now is done of the Sacrament of Confirmation.*

M. NICHOLAS.

His other chiefe argument is out of Eſtius *in theſe words* Quod ſi quæras &c. *but if thou aske whether the omiſſion of* Confirmation *when it can*

commodiouſly be had &c. pagin. 87. numero 18.

THE REPLY.

M. Nicholas maketh M. Doctour *ſay more then he doth, to wit that euery one in particular is bound to take* Confirmation *with hazard of perſecution, whereas* M. Doctour *ſayeth onely, that a countrie ſhould hazard perſecution rather then want Confirmation.*

Eſtius in 4. d.c.

29. Eſtius propoſeth a queſtion; *whether the omiſsion of Confirmation when it may be had commodiouſlie be a mortall or veniall ſinne.* And anſwereth *that it cannot be omitted without mortall ſinne in tyme and place of perſecution of faith*, when (*forſooth*) *by reaſon of infirmitie, there is danger to a man leaſt he deny his faith in word or deede, or at leaſt be aſhamed to confeſſe* (his faith) *when he ſhould.* And *M Doctour* ſayeth the ſame, as appeareth by his words which immediatlie follow theſe words of *Eſtius.* For if the reader turne ouer to the page 386. and 8. number, he ſhall find theſe words of *M. Doctours. But howſoeuer, although euerie man in particular cãnot be condemned of ſinne for omitting Confirmation, for feare of looſing his life, lands, or libertie, Yet I thinke that neither any countrie or any one of the countrie, for feare of perſecution, can oppoſe againſt the coming in of a Biſhop, though thereby, onely the Sacrament of Confirmation ſhould be wanting.*

30. So that *M Nicholas* playeth not faire playe with *M. Doctour* in making him ſay that Catholikes in particular are bound to receiue Confirmation with loſſe of life, libertie or goods, whereas

as *M. Doctour* confeſſeth in the aforeſayed place, and before it alſo *num.* 3. & 4. graunteth, that none in particular are bound with ſuch danger; and onelie ſayeth, that neither a countrie nor any one of the countrie (which yet he humblie ſubmitteth to authoritie) can except againſt a Bishop, or Confirmation for feare of perſecution in generall; notwithſtanding which generall perſecution, many commodiouſlie and without danger may receiue Confirmation. And this *Eſtius*, when he ſayeth, that if Confirmation can commodiouſlie be had in time of perſecution, it cannot be refuſed by particular perſons vnder mortuall ſinne, ſuppoſeth.

31. The reaſon of this is, becauſe there may be a generall perſecution, and yet many in particular, may commodiouſlie haue Confirmation. For as notwithſtanding perſecution, and the generall lawes of England enacted againſt receiuing a Prieſt, hearing Maſſe or going to Confeſſiō, many Catholikes in particular without morall danger may many tymes receiue a Prieſt, heare Maſſe, and goe to Confeſſion, as thouſands haue done: ſo many Catholikes may receiue the Bishop, and Confirmation of him without any imminent or morall danger; and therefore hetherto not any haue ſuffered loſſe in life, libertie or goods for receiuing of cōfirmation though thousāds haue receiued it. And as, although perſecution in England is the greater for Prieſts, Ieſuites, and other regulars, yet many can, and do without morall

danger heare Maſſe (as they are bound on holy dayes , when they can commodiouſlie) can goe to Confeſſion and the like: ſo although the perſecution in England were greater for the Biſhop (as it is not, there being no ſpeciall lawes in force againſt him) yet many might receiue him, and Confirmation of him, without any imminēt danger : and conſequentlie according to *Eſtius* his opinion, are bound vnder mortall ſinne to receiue Confirmation, when there is danger, by reaſon of infirmitie, of denying their faith, or of fearing to profeſſe it when they should. And ſo I meruaile that *M. Nicholas* could not ſee the difference, betwixt perſecution in generall, and in particular, for that perſecution in generall doth not excuſe particular men from receiuing Confirmation, they, notwithſtanding a generall perſecution hauing commoditie to receiue it without danger: but when the perſecution is particular to men in particular, then they cannot without danger, and ſo are excuſed. yet nether a countrie nor any of the countrie can except againſt Prieſts coming into the countrie by reaſon of a generall perſecution, becauſe notwithſtanding ſuch a perſecution, many in particular may heare Maſſe, receiue the B. Sacrament, goe to confeſſiō, heare a ſermon now and then, without imminent danger; and ſo for reſpect and regard of theſe (who haue right to the Sacrament) none can except againſt the coming in of Prieſts : into a countrie ſeing that if the countrie were depriued

of

of Prieſts, none could heare Maſſe, goe to confeſſion, receiue the Sacraments, or heare exhortations: and ſo at this day, if Prieſts had not bene ſent into England maugre perſecution, there had now ſcarce any Catholike or Catholike Religion bene left in England: *& niſi Dominus exercituum reliquiſſet nobis ſemen, quaſi Sodoma fuiſſemus, & quaſi Gomorrha ſimiles eſſemus: Vnleſſe the Lord of Hoſtes had left vs* (this) *ſeed we had bene as Sodome, and we ſhould be like to Gomorrha.* Iſai. 1.

32. So although no man in particular be bound to receiue the Bishop into his houſe, or Confirmation of him with imminent danger of the aforeſayed temporall loſſes: Yet a countrie could not except againſt a Bishop or Confirmation, for feare of perſecution in generall: for that, notwithſtanding ſuch a generall perſecution, many might without the aforeſayed danger receiue a Bishop and Confirmation at his hands, as wee ſee they haue done in England. And ſo in regard of theſe who haue right to a Bishop and to Confirmation, none can except againſt the coming in of a Bishop lawfullie ſent (vnleſſe as *M. Doctour* ſayeth *p.* 378. *n.* 3. the perſecution were ſo great that the Bishop could not enter, or would preſently be apprehended or put to death) becauſe without a Bishop many ſhould want the confort, encouragement and example of ſuch a Paſtour, & they ſhould want Confirmation which as *Eſtius* ſayeth cannot in tyme of perſecution, and when there is danger of falling to many, who might

commodiouslie receiue it, be omitted without mortall ſinne, as we ſhall proue anone.

M. NICHOLAS.

His laſt argument is out of a coniecture, that without Confirmation *if one fall not, others probablie will, as he ſayeth* Nouatus *did* n. 19.

THE REPLY.

That Nouatus *fell for want of* Confirmation, *and that in time of perſecution, without that Sacrament, if one fall not, others will.*

33. *M. Doctour* indeed ſayed *pag.* 387. *n.* 8. that if in tyme of perſecution there were not a Biſhop to giue Confirmation: if one fall not, others probablie would, as *Nouatus* did for want of it. But *M. Nicholas* ſayeth, that of *Nouatus* he findeth no ſuch thing in *Euſebius*, to wit, that in tyme of perſecution he fell, for want of Confirmation.

34. And indeed neither *Euſebius* nor *Cornelius* by him alleadged doe ſay ſo in expreſſe termes, but they do ſo inſinuate, and ſo it followeth out of their words, that as other writers haue done, ſo *M Doctour* might ſay, that *Nouatus* (others, as *Baronius* ad *Pamelius* call him *Nouatianus*) did fall in time of perſecution for want of Confirmation.

Euſeb. l 6 c. 33 alias 35. iuxta verſ. Chriſtophorſoni.

35. For *Euſebius* ſaieth firſt, that *Cornelius* in an Epiſtle to *Fabianus* telleth all the particulars, *quis, qualis fuerit vita vel moribus, & quomodo ab Eccleſia Dei declinauerit: Who, what manner of man he was in life and manners, and how he declined from the Church.* And after he ſayeth of him. *Et quod iacens in lecto, pro neceſſitate perfuſus ſit &c.* and that lying

in

in his bed he was baptized out of neceſſitie, and that *the reſt which are wont to follow Baptiſme, were not ſolemnelie fulfilled, and that he was not conſummated by the ſeale of Chriſme: whereupon neither could he euer deſerue the holy Ghoſt*: that is, in that ſpeciall manner as he is giuen by Confirmation, that is to giue courage to profeſſe our faith in tyme of perſecution. For as S. *Hierome* auerreth the Holie Ghoſt is alſo giuen by Baptiſme, yea (as Diuines graunte) by other Sacraments, ſo oft as by them wee receiue iuſtifying grace, but not in that ſpeciall manner, nor to that particular end, which is to giue force to profeſſe our faith in time of perſecution, maugre all threates and tormentes of the Tyrant. And therefore *Euſebius* a little after addeth that *Cornelius* writeth alſo of *Nouatus*, *that in time of perſecution when he lurked in a certaine little celle*, (for feare) *and was deſired by the Deacons, as the manner is, to helpe the Catechumenes at their departure out of this life, he fearing to come out*, denyed himſelfe to be a Prieſt. And preſentlie after hee telleth how he alſo fell into Schiſme. And ſo ſeing that he fell in perſecution, and wanted the holy Ghoſt for want of Confirmation, if we put all this together we ſhall find it at leaſt verie probable; that hee fell for want of Confirmation, though other cauſes might concurre, as ambition, which *M. Nicholas* alleadgeth in that manner, as though he meant couertelie to glaunce at the ambition of Prieſts who deſire a Bishop: though (as aboue I haue tould him) in this tyme there is little cauſe

Li. aduerſus Luciferianos.

why out of ambition any should desire a Bishop; and I pray God there be not ambition also in seeking to hinder the Catholikes from hauing a Bishop.

36. But that *Nouatus* fell for want of Confirmation, diuers before *M. Doctour* haue affirmed. As first The venerable and learned Authours of the Rhemes Testament (of whom *M. Doctour* had it) who writing on the eight Chapter of the Actes haue deliuered these words: *To conclude, neuer none denied or contemned this Sacrament of Confirmation and holy Chrisme but knowne heretikes. S. Cornelius that B. Martyr so much praised of S. Cyprian ep. ad Fabium apud Euseb l. 6. c. 35. affirmeth that Nouatus fell to heresie for that he had not receiued the holy Ghost by the consignation of a Bishop, whom all the Nouatians did follow, neuer vsing that holie Chrisme.*

37. Fulke in his answere to the notes of the Rhemists on this place answereth, that *Nouatus omitted the ceremonie of anointing, yet doth not Cornelius say that he fell into heresie because he had not receiued the holie Ghost by consignation of a Bishop, but onely sheweth what manner a man he was.* Thus he answereth the Rhemists. And *M. Nicholas* ioyneth with him in his answere to *Maister Doctour*, saying: *Onely Eusebius out of Cornelius in an Epistle to Fabianus reconnteth that he fell, persecutionis tempore, metu debilitatus & nimia vitæ cupiditate adductus; in tyme of persecution; weakened with feare, and moued with too*

much

much deſire of life. And preſentlie after ſayeth *Maiſter Nicholas*: *It may be well that he fell for want of Confirmation*: Yet as Fulke ſayed, ſo he ſaieth, *I deny that Euſebius ſayeth ſo.* But I had rather giue credit to the Rhemiſts then to *M. Nicholas*, I hauing eſpeciallie found him tripping ſo often and their one affirmation ought to be taken before tenne negations or denialls of *M. Nicholas. Eſtius* alſo hauing ſayed that the Apoſtles vſe to giue Confirmation ſo ſoone after batiſme as might conuenientlie be, ſayeth: *Quorum alacritatem & ſtudium in conferendo hoc Sacramentum imitari conuenit omnes Epiſcopos, maximè quod huius ſubſidij neglectu fiat, vt perſecutionis tempore multi deficiant aut labantur, ſicut teſte Cornelio Papa, Nouato accidit: Whoſe alacritie and ſtudie in giuing this Sacrament, it is conuenient that all Bishops should imitate, eſpeciallie becauſe by neglect of this helpe, it comes to paſſe in time of perſecution that many doe fayle or falle as (witneſſe Pope Cornelius) it happened to Nouatus.* Behould another authour of greater credit then *Maiſter Nicholas* as being a Claſſicall Authour, & hauing bene many yeares profeſſour of diuinitie in the famous Vniuerſitie of Doway, affirmeth alſo with *M. Doctour* and againſt *M. Nicholas*, that *Nouatus* fell in tyme of perſecution for want of Confirmation. Bzouius alſo in his firſt tome ſpeaking of *Nouatus* or *Nouatianus* ſaieth thus of him: *morbo tandem elapſus, neque cætera quibus poſt Baptiſmum ſecundum Eccleſiæ Canonem, imbui*

Eſtius in 4. d. 7. §. 18.

Bzouius to. 1. l. 3 Eccl hist. Anno. Christi 254. Corn. Papa an. 1. Colu 249.

imbui oportuerat, acquisiuit; neque Domini sigillo ab Episcopo obsignatus, quamobrem neque Spiritum sanctum ex sacro Chrismate adeptus, persecutionis metu debilitatus, & nimia vitæ cupiditate adductus, se presbyterum esse neganit: At lenght hauing escaped, his sickness, he neither got the rest with which according to the Ecclesiasticall Canon he should haue beene imbued or furnished, nor was he signed with our Lords seale: Wherefore neither hauing by the sacred Chrisme gotten the holie Ghost, he in time of persecution being weakened with feare (to witt becausse by Confirmation he had not gottē the holie Ghost) *and moued with toomuch desire of, life he denyed himselfe to be a priest.* And after, Bzouius relateth how at the requeſt of the Deacons he refuſed to helpe them that were in danger and neceſſitie; but in a Choler want from them, and afterward fell into Schiſme in ambitiouſlie aſpiring to be Pope: And why all this, but becauſe he had not by Confirmation receiued the holy Ghoſt. *Baius lib. 2. Inſtit. c. 63. l. 2. de Conf. c. 63. nam ideo Nouatum ad hæreſim procliuiorem fuiſſe ſenſit Cornelius Papa quoniam ſignaculo Chriſmatis confirmatus non eſſet, Euſebio teſte l. 6. hi c. 33.* For Cornelius Pope thought that *Nouatus* was more proue to hereſie becauſe he was not confirmed by the ſeale of Chriſme, as *Euſebius* witneſſeth *libr. 6. Hiſtor. cap. 33. Lorinus* a Ieſuite ſayeth that *Nouatus* was poſſeſſed by the derull becauſe he receiued not the Sacrament, yea reiected it? With theſe Catholike Authours *M. Do-*

In c 8 Act. ve 17. in fine.

Doctour thought it more honour to ioyne, then with Fulke the heretike as *M. Nicholas* in this doth.

38. Now whereas *M. Nicholas* ſayeth, that he hath anſwered to *M. Doctours* coniecture (ſo he calleth it) that in time of perſecution, Confirmation is neceſſarie for a countrie, becauſe if one fall not, others will; I graunt that he hath endeauoured in the beginning of this queſtion *numero* 6. and 7. but, could neuer yet performe that he hath endeauoured. He ſayeth *numero* 6. that the tymes of perſecution in our Countrie haue beene moſt bitter; *and yet would to God wee could behould the zeale, fernour, Charitie and conſtancie, which in theſe dayes Catholikes without Confirmation shewed.* But why ſpeaketh hee in this manner? Doth he thinke a countrie in perſecution may doe better without Confirmation then with it, or that it helpeth nothing? Why then did Chriſt inſtitute it to the end that in perſecution we might with an vndaunted courage profeſſe our faith before the perſecutour? And ſayeth hee. *I hould it noe rashneſſe to ſaye, that ſince Englands enioying a Bishop, more harme hath befalne Catholik's in generall.* See how Paſſion tranſporteth *Maiſter Nicholas*? And by whoſe fault is it that ſince we had a Bishop more harme hath befalne Catholikes in generall? Is it the preſence of a Bishop that bringeth ſuch harme? Why then did Chriſt and the holie Ghoſt appoint

Act. 20. point Bishops to gouerne the Churche? Other Countries in tyme of perſecution haue euer receiued greate benefits, much comfort and encouragement by their Bishops: Why then should we onely receiue *a generall harme* by hauing a learned Bishop, a man of exemplar life, and a bishop ſent by lawfull and higheſt authoritie? I will not ſay who are the cauſe, but I referre that to all indifferent mennes iudgements, and euen to *Maiſter Nicholas* his calmer diſpoſition, and better conſideration. If euerie one had receiued and obeyed him as they ought to haue done (Saint Peters ſucceſſour ſending him) and if they who found themſelues grieued, had propoſed their grieuances and difficulties vnto Superiours in all quiet modeſtie, and without clamours, and had patientie expected their deciſion, and determination, there had not ariſen ſuch ſcandall as there did.

39. But to come to the matter. *Maiſter Doctour* ſayed, that although euen in tyme of perſecution a man may haue ſufficient grace without Confirmation to ſtand to his faith and Religion, as may appeare by them who neither confirmed nor Baptized with water, haue endured martyrdome for their faith, and ſo haue bene baptized in their owne blood, and as may be ſeene in our English Catholikes who (though many of them were not confirmed)

Ca 14 n. 7.

med) shed their blood to ſeale and ſigne their faith: Yet becauſe Confirmation is the ordinarie meanes inſtituted to giue force and courage in tyme of perſecution: to neglect it in ſuch a tyme when euerie man may feare his owne infirmitie, is a mortall ſinne: and if it be neglected for a generall perſecution (in which, as aboue, many thouſands in particular may commodiouſlie receiue it) if one fall not as *Maiſter Doctour* ſayeth, others probablie will as *Nouatus* did: And ſo, a countrie in ſuch a perſecution is obliged to receiue a Bihop, leaſt it ſhew it ſelfe cruell to ſo many thouſands, who haue right to the Sacrament, and might notwithſtanding a generall perſecution commodiouſlie receiue, and may fall for want of it. *Eſtius in 4. diſt. 7. § 18. Ca. 14. n. 8.*

40. Of this I ſhall giue theſe enſuing reaſons. The firſt is this. Euen in tyme of a generall perſecution (of which we ſpeake) many and ſometymes manie thouſands, as aboue is shewed, may receiue this holie Sacrament of Confirmation without any morall danger (as now in England, ſince we had our two moſt Reuerend Bishops, many thouſands haue done) and ſeing that all theſe by Chriſt his inſtitution haue right to Confirmation; the reſt of the countrie cannot, for a generall perſecution, refuſe this Sacrament, leaſt they ſhould doe greate iniurie to ſo many. Secondlie they who in tyme of a generall perſecu-

tion

tion when they may in particular receiue this Sacrament, doe neglect it, though they know not how ſoone they may be called to make profeſſion of their faith, doe ſeeme to preſume to much of God his extraordinarie grace: for ſeing that Confirmation is the ordinarie meanes to get this grace, thereby to confeſſe their faith, if they neglect it, preſuming of God his grace without this meanes, it cannot be but a great preſumption.

41. Thirdelie in tyme of perſecution when one is apprehended and brought before the perſecutour, he vſeth to threaten loſſe of Landes and goods, libertie and life it ſelfe: hee therefore who in tyme of perſecution ſeeth himſelfe expoſed to all theſe difficulties, had neede to arme himſelfe by all the meanes he can: and (whatſoeuer *Maiſter Nicholas* ſayeth) he may feare his owne infirmitie, for that it is not an eaſie thing, euen with ordinarie grace, to forſake Landes, goods, libertie, life, Father, mother, wife, and children, rather then to deny or not to profeſſe his faith; and it is aboue the force of flesh and blood: and although he may haue grace ſufficient (as manie in our Countrie without Confirmation haue had) yet this grace which giueth force to profeſſe our faith before the Tyrant, is not due to anie but theſe who are confirmed, to whom it is due by the Sacrament and character which

it

it imprinteth, as ahoue I haue declared. Where- 3. par.
fore *Ægidius* Coninck a Ieſuite ſaieth, that q. 72.
it may be a mortall ſinne not to receiue this art. 8.
Sacrament by reaſon of ones conſcience; *Vt* n. 89;
ſi omnino crederet ſibi imminere periculum niſi hoc Sacramentum ſuſciperet, quod ſæpe poſſet contingere in ijs qui verſantur continuò inter hæreticos, & vel minis, vel promiſſis, aut alia ratione ad defectionem ſollicitantur, nam eſt ſingulare Dei donum in talibus caſibus fidem conſtanter tueri, quod etſi Deus paratus eſt omnibus dare, tamen ſæpe minus liberaliter illud dat ijs qui non vtuntur mediis ab ipſo ad hoc inſtitutis, qualis eſt Confirmatio: As if one ſhould altogether beleeue, that he ſhould be in danger vnleſſe he receiued this Sacrament, which might oftentymes happen in thoſe who liue continuallie amongſt heretikes (as English Catholikes doe) *and who there by threates or promiſes or otherwiſe are ſollicited to forſake their faith* (as English Catholikes are.) *For it is a ſingular guift of God to defend conſtantlie ones faith in ſuch caſes; which guift though God be readie to giue, yet oftentymes, he leſſe liberallie beſtoweth it on theſe who vſe not the meanes by him inſtituted to this, as is Confirmation.* And ſo as a Vigilant and prudent ſoldiour when he is in the field and knoweth not how ſoone the enemie will aſſault him, is alwayes armed and euen ſleepeth in his armour: So the prudent Chriſtian in tyme of perſecution, when he knoweth not how

how ſoone the perſecutour may ſet vpon him, ought alwayes to be armed, and eſpecially with the armour of proofe, *Confirmation*, it being the proper armour inſtituted by Chriſt to be vſed in time of perſecution.

42. But *M. Nicholas pagin.* 88. & 89. ſayeth that when *Eſtius* ſayeth that Confirmation cannot be omitted without mortall ſinne in time of perſecution, *he ſpeaketh in time and place of ſuch perſecution of faith, as bringeth with it danger of a mans denying his faith, which thankes be to God, we may ſay is not our caſe in England, where &c.* And is there not danger in England of *a mans denying his faith*? I would to God there were not. Is there not danger of a mans denying his faith in England where not longe ſince a Prieſt and a lay man were executed for their faith at Lancraſter? and where many alſo not ſo long ſince were enforced to abiure their faith, not onely for the tyme preſent, but alſo for the tyme to come: where ſo many not longe ſince had their Landes ſeazed on? Where the Purſiuantes do lye in waite and watch continuallie to apprehend Catholikes? where the Lawes are ſtill in force and may be executed euerie day? *M. Nicholas* ſaieth in the hoateſt perſecution the zeale of many was admirable. I graunte it, and the greater was Gods grace to them, but many alſo then fell, of whom ſome no doubt would haue ſtood conſtantlie to their faith, if they had had Confirmation.

43. Fourth-

42. Fourthlie, although heretofore in *Queene Elizabethes* raigne or, whē we had not the honour nor hoppines to haue a Bishop and ſo conſequentlie were depriued of Cōfirmation. God out of his greate mercie ſupplied the want of Confirmation, and gaue to many the grace of Confirmation without Confirmation: Yet now when we may haue a Bishop (as thankes be God we haue) and may commodiouſlie in tyme of perſecution receiue Confirmation (as thouſands haue done without any temporall loſſe or domage) to excepte againſt a Bishop and conſequētlie againſt Confirmation, of which the Bishop onely, is at leaſt, the ordinarie Miniſter, almightie God might iuſtlie and should haue iuſt reaſon to deny vs that grace, and many for want of it would fayle and fall as *Nouatus* and others haue done.

43. Laſtlie, it cannot be denyed but that Chriſtians are more able and likely with this Sacramēt to profeſſe their faith, thē they are without it: and that more in a countrie perſecuted are like to ſtand to the profeſſion of their faith with this Sacramēt the without, elſe this Sacrament should be needleſſe, and Chriſt to litle purpoſe should haue inſtituted it: *ergo* in a countrie perſecuted & deſtitute of this Sacrament, many doe fall who otherwiſe would ſtand, and for euerie one that ſtandeth, perhaps twentie will fall.

44. For theſe reaſons in the primatiue Church the cuſtome was to giue Cōfirmatiō preſētlie after baptiſme, that ſo the baptized might neuer want

his ſpeciall armour inſtituted againſt perſecution.

Act. 2. *Saint Peter* by his firſt ſermon hauing conuerted about three thouſand, bad *them doe pennance, and be euerie one baptized*, and what elſe? *and you ſhall, ſaieth he, receiue the guift of the holy ghoſt*, the proper effect of Confirmation, giuen preſentlie after Baptiſme. And when S. *Philipp* had conuerted and baptized the Samaritans, becauſe hee (as being no Bishop) could not confirme them, the Apoſtles who were in Hieruſalē hearing of their conuer-

Act. 8. ſiō ſent *S. Peter* and *Ihon* that of them they might be confirmed and receiue the holie Ghoſt. In like māner ſo ſoone as certaine diſciples at *Epheſus*

Actor. 19. were baptized, *Saint Paul* impoſed handes vpon them and gaue then the holy Ghoſt. And the firſt Popes and Bishops following herein the A-Apoſtles example, neuer ſeparated (but in caſe of neceſſitie, the one Sacrament from the other,

S. Cle. 4. Ep ad Epiſt. Hiſpa. and therefore *S. Clement*, as aboue we haue ſeene, biddeth all to haſten after baptiſme to be conſigned of the Bishop: and *S. Melchiades* Pope, ſayeth that theſe two Sacraments, Baptiſme and Confirmation, are ſo linked together, *vt ab inuicem, niſi morte præueniente, nullatenus poſſint ſegregari, & vnum ſine altero ritè perfici non poteſt*: *that vnleſſe by preuenting death, they can in no wiſe (according to that ancient cuſtome in tyme of perſecution) be ſeparated nor the one without the other*

Eſtius in 4. d. 7 §. 18 cannot rightlie be accomplished. And ſo I conclude with *Eſtius* (as before) that it is a thing verie fitting and conuenient, eſpeciallie in tyme

of

of perſecution, that all Biſhops following the example of theſe their worthie Predeceſſors, ſhould haue can that Confirmation ſhould not be differred too long after Baptiſme (much leſſe quite omitted as *M. Nicholas* would) *maximè quod huius ſubſidij neglectu fiat, vt perſecutionis tempore multi deficiant aut labantur, ſicut teſte Cornelio Papa, Nouato accidit: eſpeciallie becauſe by a neglect of this ayde or ſuccour it commeth to paſſe, that in tyme of perſecution many do fayle or fallie, as (witneſſe S. Cornelius Pope) it happened to Nouatus.*

THE FIFTH QVESTION.

Concerning M. Doctours *compariſon betweene* Biſhops, *inferiour Paſtours, and* Religious *men.*

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

MVCH againſt my will I ame enforced to handle this point by occaſion of M. Doctour *his Treatiſe, through all which, and particularlie in his* 11. *Chapter, he ſpeaketh with ouer much partialitie and diſaduantage of a Religious ſtate in compariſon of Biſhops and other inferiour Paſtours, or Curates.* n.1.

THE REPLY.

M. Nicholas *vntruelie accuſeth* M. Doctour *of partialitie in comparing of Biſhops and other Paſtours with Religious.*

1. Whereas

1. WHereas *M. Nicholas* accuſeth *M. Doctour* of partialitie in comparing the ſtate of Bishops and other Paſtours with the ſtate of Religious, I anſwere for him, as *Suarez* anſwereth for himſelfe to a ſuppoſed obiection which might be made againſt him, for making the ſelfe ſame compariſon. *Hæc comparatio* (ſayeth he) *odioſa videri poteſt, & ideo vitanda, vt tetigit Valenſis lib. 3. tom. 3. de Sacramentalis. titul. 9. capit. 8. veruntamen facile tollitur inuidia &c. This compariſon may ſeeme odious, and therefore to be ſhunned as Waldenſis ſayeth libr. 3. tom. 3. de Sacramentalibus tit. 9. c. 8. but yet the enuye is eaſilie taken away, if both prudentelie and modeſtlie it be handled; and if with all it be conſidered, that the* compariſon *is not made betwixt perſons, but ſtates: and their conditions and qualities; or, as* S. *Thomas ſayeth* 22. *q.* 184. *art.* 8. *if compariſon be made of the kinde and nature of the worke, not of the charitie of the worker as Chriſt preferred the contemplatiue life before the actiue Luc.* 7. *ſaying that* Marie *had choſen the beſt parte.* And I referre me to the Reader, what moderation *M. Doctour* hath vſed both in his Epiſtle dedicatorie and throughout all his Treatiſe, and euen in his 11. Chapter, where he makes noe compariſons *betwixt perſons*, but onely *betwixt ſtates and their* conditions and qualities, and yeeldeth to the Regulars as much as *Saint Thomas of Aquin* and *Suarez* doe, and giueth no more to Bishops and other Paſtours then they and all Diuines, euen Regulars doe.

Suarez to 3 l. de Statu perfectionis c. 18.

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

First then we will speake of Bishops; and in the second place, of inferiour Pastours. n.1.

THE REPLIE.

M. Nicholas *cannot denie but that Bishops are in higher and perfecter state of perfection, as is proued.*

2. *M. Nicholas* after he hath tould vs that he will first speake of Bishops and their state, maketh some vnnecessarie preambles from the page 92. and number 2. to the 5. number, endeauoureth to *answere this first comparison*, but his endeauours are all vayne; for that he neither hath, neither can he, or any for him euer proue or shew, that the Regular state is to be parangoned to the Episcopall. And that the state of a Bishop is higher then the state of the regular, it is the common and confessed opinion of *S. Thomas* and all Diuines which *Suarez* prooueth largelie and learnedlie.

S. Th. 2. 2. q 184.

Suarez tom. 3 l. 1 de Statu perfectionis c 18.

3. This is his conclusion concerning Bishops: *Dico ergo primo Episcoporum Statum esse perfectiorem quocunque statu religioso: ac subinde statum perfectionis exercendæ, perfectiorem ex suo genere esse, quam statum acquirēdæ perfectionis: I say therefore, first that the state of Bishops is perfecter then any Religious state: and that the state of perfection to be exercised, is of its nature and kind perfecter, then the state of perfection to be acquired.*

This

This conclusion concerning the first parte of it, I could proue by many arguments, as *M. Doctour* hath done in his 11. *Chapter numero* 14. but, that lesse exception may be taken against my proofes they shalbe no other in effect then those which *Suarez* hath.

4. First he proueth this out of Fathers, whome he alleadgeth in his fifteeth chapter, and amongst them *S. Clement* in his first Epist. Which Fathers doe not onelie affirme that Bishops are in the state of them that are perfect, but also in that height that noe state can equalise thē; and therefore they stile Bishops *most Holie, the Legates of Christ, spirituall Fathers, pillars of the Church.*

5. Secondlie this I proue as *Suarez* doth by the functions of a Bishop, to which by his state he is obliged: for as powers are specified of their actions, and therefore the vnderstanding is a perfecter power then the will, the will then the sensitiue appetite, the power of seing then the power of hearing: so the state of perfection takes its eminencie ouer other states, by its more perfect fuctions. And therefore seing that to the Bishops state there belonge the highest functions in God his Church, his state is the perfectest of all states in the sayed Church. That the Bishop hath the most excellent and eminent functions, it is manifest: for that he by his state hath all the perfections and excellencies which are in the states and fruictions of inferiour prelates, and in a more eminent manner for he hath power to teache and

preach, and to illuminate others by the word of God, which he preacheth, as inferiour Pastors haue; yea this function of preaching principallie belõgeth to him, as the Councell of Trent hath defined, saying that it is *præcipuum Episcoporum munus*, *the chiefe office of a Bishop*: as indeede it is, according to the commandement of Christ giuen to the Apostles, and in them, to Bishops their successours: *prædicate Euangelium omni creaturæ: preach, the Ghospell to all creatures.* And besides he hath his owne proper functions, which they haue not, to wit, to gouerne a more ample parte of the whole Church, to sit in Councells as Iudge, to direct and Iudge inferiour Pastours, to ordaine ministers, to confirme, to consecrate Churches, Altars, Chalices &c. which other Pastours cannot doe. Likewise it pertaineth most of all to Bishops by their examples to illuminate others, euen inferiour Pastours, and therefore they especiallie are *the light of the world* and they especiallie like good Pastours are *to goe before their sheepe* by illuminating them by doctrine and example. For as the eleuenth Councell of Tolet sayeth: *by how much any one hath the higher place, by so much the more it is necessarie, that he goe before others in grace of merits &c.*

Conc. Trid. sess. 5. c. 2. & sess. 24 c. 4. Marci. vlt. Mat 5 Ioan. 10. Conc. Tol. 11. c. 2.

6. Thirdlie saieth *Suarez* in a Bishop especially is required greate charitie, as well towards God, who is the principall Lord of his sheepe, & therefore Christ calleth them *his sheepe*: as also towards his subiectes whom he must tolerate and assiste;

Ioan. 21.

with

with whose infirmities he must beare, whose necessities he must releeue, and to whom he must be an honorable seruant as S. *Paul* was, when he sayed: *factus sum omnium seruus vt plures lucrifacerem: I made my selfe the seruant of all, that I might gaine the more.* 1. Cor. 9.

7. Fourthlie, the Bishop peculiarlie and in the first place, by his office and state is bound to *giue his life for his sheepe*, which is the *greatest charitie*, and which requireth greate patience and fortitude. Ioan. 10. & 15.

8. Lastlie the perfection and height of the state of a Bishop, may be gathered by what *M. Doctour* hath sayed in his 6. Chapt. where he hath shewed that the Bishop is higher in dignitie, power and authoritie, then the simplie Priest, by the Diuine Institution; for that he can confirme and giue orders, and with two other Bishops can ordaine a Bishop: Which simple Priests cānot doe, at least, as ordinarie ministers; and therefore the Councell of Trent sayeth, that Bishops, *doe principallie appertaine to the Hierarchicall order.* Conc. Trid. sess. 23. cap. 4. de Sacram. Ordin.

9. The same may be deduced by what he hath deliuered in his seuēth Chapter, were he hath proued, that Bishops and Priests, are of the higest orders in the Church. This he hath proued out of diuers Fathers and examples, euen of Emperours who attribute much to the dignitie *of Bishops*, and amongst those Fathers he cieth S. *Ignatius*, who sayeth, that in the Church of God, *there is nothing greater then the Bishop.* Ignat. ep. ad Smyrn

10. The

10. The ſame may be alſo gathered out of his eleuenth Chapter *n.* 18. Where he alleageth *S. Thomas* his words: *Status religionis ad perfectionem pertinet, quaſi quædam via in perfectionem tendens: Status autem Epiſcoporum ad perfectionem pertinet, tanquam quoddam perfectionis Magiſterium. Vnde ſtatus religionis comparatur ad ſtatum Epiſcopalem, ſicut diſciplina ad magiſterium, & diſpoſitio ad perfectionem: The ſtate of Religion pertaineth to perfection, as a certaine way tending vnto perfection: But the ſtate of Biſhops pertaineth to perfection as a certaine maiſtership of perfection. Whence it is that the ſtate of Religion is compared to the Epiſcopall ſtate as inſtructio to maiſterſhip.* *M.* Doctour alſo alleadgeth there *Henricus de Gandauo* who hath the like words, and thence he concludeth, that where the Religious endeth, there a Biſhop or Paſtour beginneth. For (as Chriſt ſayeth) *the diſciple is not aboue the maiſter, nor the ſeruant aboue his Lord. It ſufficeth the diſciple, if he be as his maiſter.* And ſeldome it is ſeene, that the Scholler attaineth to the perfection of his maiſter: and if he doth, yet the ſtate of a Scholler is lower then the ſtate of a maiſter, and it requireth leſſe perfection. Wherefore Henricus as *M. Doctour* alleadged, *ſayeth that the maiſter ought to be perfecter thē the Scholler*: and againe: *that when any Religious is brought, ad ſummum aliquid & perfectum, to the hight of perfection; he is then fit to be aſſumed for a Prelate.*

S. Th. 2. 2 q. 185 ar 8. in Corp.

Henr. quodl. 12. q. 29.

Math. 10.

Henr Supra.

11. Why doth then *M.* Nicholas ſo ſtorme againſt *M.* Doctour as though he had ſpoken *partially and with diſaduantage of a religious ſtate through all his Treatiſe, and particularly in his* 11. *Chapter*? Hath he

fayed more for Bishops, or leſſe for Regulars, or could he ſay more for Bishops then *S. Thomas*, *Suarez* and *Henricus* haue? Yea *M. Doctour* ſpeaketh principallie out of *S. Thomas*, let him them wreake his anger on *S. Thomas* and *Suarez*.

12. So that *M. Doctour* in this, needeth neither to leaue *S. Thomas* nor *Henricus de Gandauo*, as *M. Nicholas n.* 13. ſaieth he muſt. For that concerning the ſtate of a Bishop they both agree, as their words alleadged will witneſſe; and although *Henricus* ſaieth more then *S. Thomas* doth, to wit, that not onelie the Bishop, but alſo inferiour Paſtours are in an higher ſtate of perfection then the regulars; much more in his opinion, the Bishop is in an higher ſtate thē the religious, for which onely thing *M. Doctour* alleadged him. And whereas *M. Doctour* ſaied, that *where a religious man endeth, there a Bishop or Paſtour beginneth*, which words (*or Paſtour*) *M. Nicholas* carpeth at; *M. Doctour* addeth *or Paſtour*, becauſe he knewe that *Henricus de Gandauo* and Gerſon doe hold, that euen Curats haue a ſtate of perfection aboue regulars, which opiniō *Suarez*, as we ſhall ſee, deemeth not improbable; and at leaſt, as *M. Doctour* a litle before had proued, they haue a calling and office of greater perfection thē hath the religious. Yet *M. Doctour* not ſtanding on this, concludeth onelie, that the Bishop (he now addeth not *or Paſtour*) *layeth his foundation on the religious mans roofe and top*. So that vnleſſe *M. Nicholas* will leaue *S. Thomas* the Angelicall Doctour, *Suarez* and all Diuines, he muſt graunt, that the

the Bishop is absolutelie in an higher state of perfection, then the state of Regulars is.

13. And in deede *M. Nicholas* cannot bring so much as one argument to equalize the state of a Regular to the state of a Bishop, nor hath he, or can he answere any one of *M. Doctours* argumēts by which he preferred the state of a Bishop. What then hath he done? He telleth vs *n.* 2. that we must distinguish betwixt the state, which is to exercise perfection, which is the state of Bishops, & the state which endeauoureth to attaine to perfection, which is the state of Regulars, *least we erre in generalities*, as he saied, *and be deceiued, with Specious words not well vnderstood*; as though *M. Doctour* had not in his 11. *Chap.* made the same distinction, and therefore had deceiued others. And what more? he seeketh all he can to extoll a religious state, as being more secure, yeelding more meanes to get grace: and to depresse the state of a Bishop, as requiring perfection, but yeelding no meanes to get it, as being dangerous &c. But let vs come to particulars.

M. NICHOLAS.

The Bishop is in a state which presupposeth, but doth not giue perfection: which a religious state doth not suppose, but giue. n. 5.

THE REPLY.

M. Nicholas *offereth iniurie to the state of a Bishop: for that it doth giue perfection euen* ex opere operato.

14. I find by *M. Nicholas* his dealing in this point,

point, that it is true which Philosophers say of the senses, to wit, that *sensibile supra sensum positum non facit sensationem*; and therefore the eye which can see the obiectes without it, cannot see the moate that is within it: for so *M. Nicholas* can espie odious comparisons of the state of Bishops and regulars in *M. Doctour* (who indeede made none) but he cannot see such comparisons in himselfe, because they are too neare him, as being his owne. For what comparison can be odious, if this be not, which derogateth to the verie consecration of the Bishops, as though thereby he receiued no grace? for although the state of a Bishop be holie, and is also the most eminent state aud order in the Church of God, yea and, as the Councell of Trent sayeth, is *onus Angelicus humeris formidãdum, a burden to be feared euen of Angelles shoulders*; and therefore of it selfe presupposeth grace and perfection, which may be gotten, and oftentimes is, out of a Religious state, as *M. Doctour* proueth in his 11. *Chapter n.* 11. and *Suarez* also confesseth (wherein it hath a precedence of the religious state, which requireth no such former perfection, but admitteth euen the greatest sinners, so they bring with them a purpose of amendment.) Yet the order of a Bishop which consisteth in an holy consecration vnder a certaine forme of words, giueth great plentie of grace, and consequentlie of charitie (in which consisteth perfection) and that also *ex opere operato* as other Sacraments doe.

Concil. Trid. sess. 6. de Reform. c. 1.

Suarez to. 3 de Relig. l. 1. c. 15. n. 12.

15. I graunt that *Dominicus Sotus* and others also

Scotus in 9. d. 24. q. 2 ar. 3. Bel. to. 2. l. 1. de Sacr. Ord. c. 5. Vasq to. 3. disput 260. c. 3 Petr. a Soto de Inst. Sacerd. lec. 4. de Sac. Ord. Mich. Med. l. 2. de Sacrorum hom. continentia cap. 15.

are of opinio, that the order of a Bishop is an holy office and dignitie instituted by Christ, and higher then the dignitie of as Priest, but yet no Sacrament: Yet many other Diuines doe affirme it to be a holy Sacrament which is the opinion of *C. Bellarmine, Vasquez, Petrus a Soto, Michael Medina*, and commonly of Iesuites.

16. This they proue out of *S. Paul* in the first Epistle to. *S. Timothie* and 4. *Chap. Noli negligere gratiã quæ in te est, quæ data est tibi per prophetiam, cum impositione manuum presbyterij: neglect not the grace that is in thee which is giuen thee by prophecie with the imposition of the hands of priesthood.* Out of which Words the Fathers and Catholike writers do vse to proue that order is a Sacrament, which giueth grace: and therefore seeing that in these words *S. Paul* speaketh of the ordinatiõ of Timothie a Bishop, which ordination is done by three Bishops, at least, who are vnderstood in the words *Priesthood*, Episcopall ordination must be an holy order and Sacrament, and yet not make 8. orders, because it is counted one order with priesthood, in that it essentiallie supposeth priesthood, without which presupposed, one cannot be a Bishop, & it maketh of a simple Priest an high Priest, who is called *Summus Sacerdos*. This consecration then of a Bishop which consisteth in imposition of hands of the priesthood, that is of three Bishops (as *M. Doctour* hath shewed in his Hierarchie (*chap. 6. n. 6.*) is an holy order and no lesse holy Sacramẽt, which giueth grace to the Bishop (as *S. Paul* auerreth) & no doubt, copious and abundãt grace proportio-

nable to the ſtate of a Bishop, which as it is an high ſtate ſubiect to dangers and many moleſtatiõs, ſo it requireth great grace. For if carnall marriage requireth grace to beare the burdẽs and difficulties thereof, much more doth the Conſecratiõ of a Bishop, who by his office is to exerciſe the higheſt actes of perfection, and is to gouerne others & to expoſe himſelfe by his office to many difficulties and dangers, requireth abundant grace. And this grace the Bishop receiueth by his conſecration.

17. And ſo *M. Nicholas* derogateth to the Epiſcopall ſtate & conſecratiõ when he ſaieth *n.* 5. that the Bishop, *is in a ſtate, which preſuppoſeth, but doth not giue perfection, which a religious ſtate doth not preſuppoſe, but giue.* For that the conſecration of a Bishop doth giue great grace, and that *ex opere operato* and infalliblie, whereas the religious ſtate giueth onelie *ex opere operantis* and not infalliblie, nor at all, vnleſſe to the profeſſion it maketh, and to the religious actes of pouertie, chaſtitie & obedience which it exerciſeth, charitie be adioyned.

18. Secondlie the verie exerciſe of Epiſcopall functions being the moſt eminent Hierarchicall actions, and moſt charitable and beneficiall to others, cannot but continuallie (vnleſſe the Bishop by his owne fault doe hinder) augment this grace and perfection receiued in his conſecration as *M. Nicholas* is forced to confeſſe *n.* 3. For as the maiſter by teaching others, perfecteth himſelfe in learning, ſo the Bishop in perfecting others by ordai-

ordaining, confirming, preaching, and gouerning perfecteth himselfe in grace, charitie & perfectiō.

19. And although there be greater danger in the state of a Bishop thē of a Regular (if he keepe his rule and cloister, yet the Bishop by his consecration receiueth grace to performe his office, which grace alsō is due to his consecration, and neuer wāting but by the Bishops owne fault. And this dāger proceeding from the height of the Bishops state, argueth it an higher state of perfectiō, because as *S. Hierome* saieth: *non est facile state loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri, iam cum Christo regnātium:* it is not an easie thing to stand in Paules place, to hold the degree of Peter, who now raigne with Christ. For as the High Cedars are more shaken with winds thē the low shrubbes; so they who are highest in state and dignitie, are most subiect to the winds of tēptatiōs; and yet the Bishop in Peter & Paules place may stand firmely against all such tempestes and winds, if he vse the grace which he receiueth in his consecratiō, as many a worthie Bishop hath done.

Hieron ep. ad Heliodorum Quāto amore.

M. NICHOLAS.

But these 2. states of perfectiō already acquired or to be acquired, are not so distinguished that they must of necessitie be alwaies separated. For although a secular Bishop be only in a state of perfecting others, yet a Bishop regular is in a state of perfecting himselfe and others. n. 4.

THE REPLY.

A Bishop regular is not in an higher state of perfection then a Bishop secular.

20. If *M. Nicholas* his meaning in these words be,

be, that a Bishop by his ſtate is ſo to perfect others, as he hath no meanes to perfect himſelfe, he goeth about to deceiue his Reader: for that (as enē now wee shewed) a Bishop by his conſecration receiueth copious grace, and by exerciſing his funcțiō hath meanes to encreaſe it. If his meaning be that a Regular Bishop is in an higher ſtate then a Bishop not regular, he is deceiued: for although the regular Bishop hath moe ſtates, then the Bishop not regular, yet he hath no higher ſtate. It is true that a regular Bishop if he obſerue his counſelles, vowes and rules, hath more meanes then a Bishop not regular, becauſe he hath the meanes of a Bishop and of a regular alſo: but he cannot when he is Bishop exerciſe much more his counſelles and Rules then a Secular Bishop doth: for that both are bound to chaſtitie, & the regular is now boūd to noe other obedience then the ſecular Bishop: and although the regular Bishop hath not *Dominium* of his reuenewes as the ſecular Bishop hath, yet he hath as much vſe of them, ſauing that he cannot make a teſtament, as the ſecular Bishop may. But howſoeuer he may haue more meanes to get perfection, yet he is not alwayes moſt fit to gouerne a Bishoprike.

22. Now as concerning theſe Regulars who by their inſtitute (as *M. Nicholas* ſayeth the ſame place *nu. 4.*) *beſide their owne perfection, attend alſo to the helpe of their neighbour*; that is, doe preach and miniſter Sacraments to Chriſtians at home, and to infidells abroade: I graunt that they as Prieſts are

of the Hierarchie (of which I shall speake in the next question) and doe exercise Hierarchicall actions of perfecting, illuminating and purging others: but that pertaineth not to a religious state in generall, and therefore the Regulars of the primitiue Church were few of them Priests, as wee shall see in the next question, and so did none of the Hierarchicall actions, nor did they preach or minister Sacraments: and therefore *Suarez* sayeth that although *the religious state doth sometimes exercise actions pertaining to the state of perfection to be communicated, or to be exercised about others, they doe onelie participate it instrumentallie, and by a certaine delegation from the supreame Prelats: and therefore such a state doth not attaine to the excellencie of the Episcopall state, to which these actions doe principallie, and as it were by proper right appertaine. Whereupon, the obligation of exercising such actes, and the procuring the saluation of soules, and loosing his life for them (if so it must be) is farre greater and higher in the Bishop, then in any whosoeuer simple religious, of whatsoeuer institute he be. And therefore in this respect also his state is perfecter. Moreouer the Bishops by their owne right, and all priuiledges set a parte, are Pastours and perfectors of the religious, of what order soeuer they be: and therefore by vertue of the office, more perfection is required in the Bishop.* Thus farre *Suarez*, whereas *M. Nicholas* addeth that the religious, who by their institute are not onely to perfect themselues but also others, is perfecter then the state of Curats, we shall examine that hereafter.

Suarez to. 3 l. 1 c. 18. n. 14.

M,

M. NICHOLAS.

That the ſtate of Biſhops doth not ſo wholy ouerſway the Religious ſtate as that there be not many good things in religion, which are wanting in epiſcopall ſtate &c. A vow not to be come religious is wicked and of no force &c. Something there muſt be wherein a religious ſtate ſurpaſſeth that of a Biſhop, otherwiſe it were not lawfull to vow not to accept a Biſhopricke. n. 6.

THE REPLY.

Whether a vow not to be religious be wicked; and whether one may vow not to accept a Biſhopricke.

23. All that *M. Nicholas* here alleadgeth is litle to the purpoſe; for although there may be ſome commodities in a religious life, as leſſe dãger more ſecuritie, more meanes to mortifie ſenſualitie and that therefore one may rather vow to be religious then to be a Biſhop, or to accept of that office and dignitie, yet all would not proue that the ſtate of a religious man is an higher ſtate or as high, which yet is the thing we diſpute of; for as the litle ſhrubbe is leſſe ſhaken with the winds then the Cedar, yet is not taller then it: and as the low cottage is leſſe beaten by tempeſts then the princelie pallace, yet is not higher, ſo the religious life may be a more ſecure, yet not a more perfect ſtate.

24. But ſayeth *M. Nicholas n.* 5. the more voluntarie the election of a Religious life is, the more commendable it is, and the ſtate of a Biſhop is then moſt ſecurelie accepted of, when it is leſſe wil-

willinglie accepted. I graunte this. But why? not becauſe a Religious life is a perfecter ſtate, but becauſe it being a lower ſtate is leſſe ſubiect to danger, & ſo may more willinglie be deſired & vowed. He proceedeth *n. 6. a vow made of not accepting a Bishopricke is valid and holy. A vow not to become religious is wicked, and of no force:* ergo ſayeth he, *there muſt be ſomething wherein a religious ſtate ſurpaſſeth that of a Bishop.* By the ſame argument *M. Nicholas* might preferre a religious ſtate before the ſtate of the Pope, becauſe a man may vowe to be religious yet he may not vow to be Pope; or if he may vow not to accept a Bishoprike, much more may he vow not to accept the Popedome.

25. Wherefore I demaund of *M. Nicholas* when he ſaieth that for this cauſe, *there muſt be ſomething wherein a religious life ſurpaſſeth that of a Bishop,* What he meaneth by his *ſomething*? if he meane ſome degree of ſtate or perfectim, wherein the religious life ſurpaſſeth that of the Bishop, he cõtradicteth *S. Thomas* and *Suarez* & all that aboueis alleadged to proue the ſtate of a Bishop to be the higheſt ſtate of perfection. If he meane by that *ſomething* more ſecuritie, leſſe danger, and peraduenture ſome better meanes to tame our flesh, to bridle our concupiſcence, to remoue the impediments of the loue of God, in which conſiſteth perfection: it is not to the purpoſe. For ſo there is ſomething in a flye which is not in an Eagle, ſomething in a mouſe which is not in a Liõ, ſomething in a litle shrubbe, which is not in a Cedar ſome-

ſomething in a flint which is not in a Saphire, and yet abſolutelie the Eagle ſurpaſſeth the flie, the Lion the mouſe, the Cedar the shrubbe; the Saphire the flint, and ſo there may be ſomething in a religious ſtate which is not in the ſtate of a Bishop, though this ſtate abſolutelie ſurpaſſe that.

26. But *M. Nicholas* obiecteth that to vow not to be religious, is wicked and inualid, to vow not to accept a Bishoprick is laudable and valid: *ergo* a religious ſtate hath ſome good which a Bishops ſtate hath not; elſe this might be vowed as well as that. I anſwere, firſt that to ſweare at leaſt in ſome caſe not to be religious is not wicked & yet an oath hath a greate affinitie with a vowe. For *M. Nicholas* knoweth that the Sea Apoſtolike hath commanded all theſe who will enioy the benefit of the Popes Seminaries, to ſweare that they wilbe Prieſts, and will not enter into any religious order or congregation without licence of the Pope, vnleſſe they firſt labour in the miſſiõ the ſpace of three yeares. And Nauarre ſayeth, that for one to ſweare that he will not enter into religion, or receiue holy orders is but a veniall ſinne, *ergo* it is not to be called wicked: for ſaith he if to ſweare to commit a veniall ſinne be but a veniall ſinne, to ſweare not to be religious to which, vnder noe ſinne he is bound, can be but a veniall ſinne. *Naua. in Manuali. ca. 12. n. 16.*

27. Secondlie I anſwere with the ſame Nauarre more directlie, that to vow not to be religious byndeth not, and therefore, notwithſtanding that *Naua. c. 12. n.*

vow, one may be relgious; yet ſuch a vow is but a veniall ſinne, and ſo cannot be called *wicked* as *M. Nicholas* callsit, becauſe in our English tongue, *wicked* ſoundeth as doth *impium* in the Latin tongue, and is taken for a grieuous or mortall ſinne. And therefore *M. Nicholas* could not call him that committeth onelie a veniall ſinne, a wicked or impious man.

28. Thirdely I anſwere that although to vow not to procure to be a Bishop may be holy and valid, yet to vow not to accept a Bishopricke when it is impoſed on a mā by the Pope and in neceſſitie of the Church, is not holie and valid, but it is rather wicked and inualid. For that to vow not to accept a Bishopricke in that caſe, is to vow a great diſobedience againſt authoritie, and which alſo in that caſe, is againſt the Charitie we vow to God his Church, and ſo the vow is wicked being a vow of a mortall ſinne, and it is inualid becauſe it is not *de meliori bono*, not of an act which is better done then vndone, for that in that caſe it is not better not to accept a Bishopricke impoſed by Authoritie, then to accept it. Wherefore *S. Thomas* ſayeth that to refuſe finallie the office of a Bishop pertaineth to an inordination of the will for twoe cauſes. The one becauſe it is againſt charitie, the other becauſe it is againſt humilitie, by which a man ſubiecteth himſelfe to the commandement of the ſuperiour. And in another place he ſayeth: *cum aliquis iurat quod non accipiet prælationem in caſu quo expedit eum accipere &c.* When one ſweareth that he will not accept of a prelacie when

2.2.q. 185.ar. 2.

S Tho. 2. 2. q. 89. ar. 7. ad 2.

it is expedient he should, that he ſinneth becauſe his oath hundereth a greater good. Nauarre alſo ſayeth, that he who ſweareth that he will not enter into Religion, or that he will not receiue holie orders, or that he will not accept of a Bishop ricke ſinneth, though not mortallie: and he citeth S. *S. Thomas* in the laſt place, & *Angelus*, & *Syluester*. And he ſayeth that ſuch an oath doth not bynde. *Azorius* who citeth for himſelfe *Antoninus*, ſayeth that the oath which one maketh not to accept of a Bishopricke may be broken by the priuate authoritie of him that ſweareth. And ſo to vow abſolutelie not to accept a Bishopricke is vnlawfull, becauſe in a neceſſitie one may be bound to accept is and to deſire it, and if it be impoſed by authoritie it cannot be refuſed. Onely it is lawfull and laudable to vow not to ſeeke for a Bishopricke, nor to accept of it when it is offerred and when there is no neceſſitie, and when it is not impoſed by a commanding authoritie.

Nau. in man. c. 12. n. 16.

Angelus & Sylu. v. Iuramẽtum Azor. to. 1. l. 11. c. 5.

29. Laſtelie I anſwere that although to vow to procure to be a Bishop or to ſeeke after that dignitie, where there is no neceſſitie of the Church, be ſinfull and of no force to bynd; and to vow to be a Religious man be an holie and valid vow: and to vow abſolutelie, not to procure a Bishopricke is holie and valid, & to vow abſolutely not to be a religious mā is abſolutelie vnholie and not valid: Yet that is not becauſe to be a religious man is abſolutelie better then to be a Bishop (for as *S. Paul* ſaieth, *if a man deſire a Bishops office,*

1. Tim. 3. *he desireth a good worke*, and as we haue seene and as *Suarez* affirmeth, a worke more perfect then the proper actes and functions of a religion are, but because the office of a Bishop (though good and of greater charitie & perfection then religious professiō, & in that respect fit to be vowed as much as other good workes) is subiect to auarice by reason of the riches annexed vnto it, to ambition by reason of the splendour and honour, and to presumption by reason of mans improportion to such a dignitie, and lastlie to other dangers by reason of many destractions caused by Episcopall affaires, and so cannot be so much as desired, as *S. Thomas* affirmeth: yet as he also auerreth, to desire to doe good to others, in the exercise of the Episcopal function is *of it selfe laudable and vertuous*. According to which *S. Chrysostome* cited by *S. Thomas*, sayeth: *opus quidem desiderare bonum, bonum est, primatum tamen honoris concupiscere vanitas est; primatus enim fugientem se desiderat, desiderantem se odit: To desire a good worke is good, but to couet the primacie of honour is vanitie, for that primacie desireth him that flyeth it, and hateth him that desireth it.*

Tom. 3. de Relig. c. 18.

S Tho. 2 2. q. 185. ar 3.

Chrys. hom. 35. in Mat.

30. But in necessitie of the Church, when there want men able and willing, or when other wise an vnworthie person would be preferred, to desire or to vow to be a Bishop is noe sinne, nor is the vow inualid. *Suarez* hauing sayed, that though the state of a Bishop be better then the state of a religious man *obliging to more perfect operations*, and requiring more and greater vertues, yet cannot be

vowed

vowed becauſe that onely can be vowed, which is not onely good, but alſo hath no danger annexed: yet notwithſtanding (ſayeth he) *it is not intrinſecallie euill, to vow to accept a Bishops office if it be abſtracted from theſe temporall commodities, as honour, riches, ſplendour* (as now it is in England) *and eſpeciallie if it be ioyned with the contrarie incommodities, to which it was ioyned in the primatiue Church, and as it is now in Iaponia* and *China*, yea and in England. I ſpeake ſayeth he of a vow of accepting a Bishops office, *for thē the iudgement of the fiteſſe and worthineſſe of the perſon, is left to the Superiour, and ſo the danger of preſumption is taken awaye. and other dangers are ſuppoſed not to be. Wherefore to procure a Bishop office though the ſayed conditiōs be ſuppoſed, can hardlie be approued much leſſe counſelled or vowed*: yet he alſo addeth, *that if there were greate neceſſitie of the Church to haue a Bishop*, and yet ſuch diſcommodities annexed to the *Bishopricke or dāger of death &c. and none could be foūd fit and willing: then to offer ones ſelfe* (to be a Bishop) *would be a worke of perfection and matter of vow*. By this it is euident that the ſtate of a Bishop farre paſſeth in perfectiō of ſtate the ſtate of religious, and that which *M. Nicholas* bringeth to exalte the religious, proues onelie that in it is leſſe danger and ſome good meanes to attaine to prefection, and that therefore religiō may more frequētlie & ſecurelie be vowed. *Stapl. to. 3. l. 1. c. 18. n. 5. 11. 12.*

31. But *M. Nicholas* ſayeth *n. 6. p. 99. that to deſire a Bishopricke euē for that is beſt in it, namely for the good of ſoules according to S. Thomas 2. 2. q. 185. ar. 1. ſeemes pre-*

preſumption, and there wants not who ſayeth that cō-monly it is a deadly ſinne: and he citeth in the margēt *Valentia. to. 3. diſp. 10. q. 3. puncto 228.*

32. I anſwere that this ſpoken, ſo rawlie as it is by *M. Nicholas*, may derogate to the moſt perfect and moſt neceſſarie ſtate in God his Church, yea and to *S. Thomas* alſo: and therefore needeth examination. *S. Thomas* in that place ſayeth, that in the office of a Bishop three thinges are to be conſidered. The firſt & principall is the good worke of a Bishop, by which he attendeth to the profit if his flocke in gouerning them, fieeding thē by the word of God and Sacraments &c. The 2. is the height of his degree ouer others. The 3. is that which followeth theſe twoe, to wit, riches, honour, reuerence &c. Wherefore ſayeth he, to deſire a Bishopricke for the third is auarice or ambition; for the ſecond it ſeemeth to be preſumption: but for the firſt it is of it ſelfe laudable and vertuous. But becauſe the firſt, which is the worke of a Bishop, hath annexed vnto it the height of degree, *præſumptuoſum videtur quod aliquis præeſſe appetat ad hoc quod ſubditis proſit, niſi manifeſta neceſſitate imminente: it ſeemeth preſumptuous, that one ſhould deſire to beare rule to profit others, vnleſſe in an euident and imminent neceſſitie.* So that *M. Nicholas* left out his anſwere in the laſt wordes *vnleſſe in an euident and imminent neceſſitie.* For thē it is lawfull to deſire a Bishopricke, ſo to exerciſe the function, and to profit others, elſe *S. Paul* would not haue ſayed: *he that deſireth a Bishops office deſireth a good worke.* He alleadgeth *Valētia* alſo

as

as though he ſayed abſolutely that it is a mortall ſinne to deſire a Bishopricke to profit others: but he alſo ſerueth him in the ſame māner, for he alſo ſayeth: *In caſu neceſsitatis laudabile poteſt eſſe vt qui dignus eſt appetat Epiſcopatum: In caſe of neceſsitie it may be laudable for him that is worthie to deſire a Bishopricke.* And this he ſayeth is the common opiniō as in deed it is. Emanuel *Sa* ſayeth that for the neceſſitie or vtilite of the Church a Bishopricke may be deſired. The ſame do alſo Nauarre and Tolet auerre: So doth *Henriquez*. And Nauarre againſt *Valentia*, ſaieth that to deſire a Bishopricke with the honour and reuenewes annexed, is no ſinne, but merite if it be principallie deſired for the honour of God, and the good of our neighbour. And although *Valētia* thinketh that oftētimes it is a mortall ſinne to deſire a Bishopricke though he that deſireth it be worthie and doe alſo deſire it for the end to doe his office, and to doe good to others: Yet Nauarre holdeth againſt him, and indeed if for the danger of ſinne in the diſcharging of the office (as *Valentia* ſaieth) one that is worthie and intendeth God his honour, and the good of others, may not deſire a Bishopricke, he may not accept of a paſtorship or ſeeke for it though in many places paſtorships be giuen by concurſe, becauſe though the danger be not ſo great, yet if it be a great Parish it is ſometymes not much leſſe: and if for danger one might not deſire a Bishopricke in this caſe, we could not accept of our miſſion to England where there is more danger.

Tom 3 diſp. 10 q. 3. punct. 2. Cōclus. 3. V. Epiſc. Tolet. l. 5. c. 3 Nau. tom. 3. Miſcel. 36. & 37. Henr. l. 10. c. 32. §. 3 Valentia ſup. Concl. 2.

But

But as this danger in England is not imminēt nor morall, ſo we prepare our ſelues well and demaund God his grace: ſo neither is the danger of a Bishop imminēt or morall if otherwiſe he be fit and haue a good intention. And Vaſquez a learned Ieſuite ſayeth, that as to deſire vertue or to doe an act of vertue for honour or prayſe is but a veniall ſinne of vaine glorie: ſo to deſire a Bishopricke for the honour and dignitie, ſo that one intend withall God his honour, and the good of others and be alſo fit, is but a veniall ſinne, and that therefore *S. Thomas* ſayeth, onely that it is vnlawfull and ſeemeth preſumption, but ſayeth not that it is a mortall ſinne as *Valentia* doth.

In op. dub. 1. de Epiſcopatu.

2. 2. q. 185. ar. 1.

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

If you demaund wherein this particular perfection of a religious life conſiſteth &c. I ſay it may ſeeme to conſiſt in multitude, facilitie, continuation of perpetuall actes of vertue, and effectuall meanes ſpeedilie to get it &c. n. 7.

THE REPLIE.

How M. Nicholas *herein contradicteth* S. Thomas *and* Suarez, *and how religious perfection according to* Suarez *conſiſteth not in actes but in habit.*

S. Tho. 2 2. q. 184. ar. 3. ad 1. & in corp.

33. *M. Nicholas* herein flatlie contradicteth *S. Thomas*, who in his anſwere to the firſt argument which obiected thoſe words Math. 19. *Si vis perfectus eſſe, vade vende omnia &c. If thou wilt be perfect, goe ſell the thinges that thou haſt, and giue to the poore,*

poore, and thou shalt haue treasure in heauen, and come, follow mee: sayeth: *that in those words of our Lord, something is put as the way to perfection, to wit that which is saied: goe sell all the things that thou hast and giue to the poore: But another thing is added, in which perfection consisteth, to wit, follow me. VVhereupon S. Hierom saieth, that because it is not sufficient onely to leaue* what he *hath,* Peter *addeth* what *is perfect, and* we *haue followed thee. And S. Ambrose vpon these words* Luc. 5. *follow mee:* saieth: *he bidde: h follow not by the bodyes going but by the myuds affection, which is done by charitie. And therefore by the manner of speaking it appeareth that the Counsailes are certaine instruments to come to perfection, when it is sayed: If thou wilt be perfect, goe sell &c. as if he sayed, by doing this thou shall, come to This end. thus S. Thomas.* And so pouertie, chastitie, obedience and other actes of vertue exercised in religion are not as *M. Nicholas* sayeth, the perfection of a religious life, but onely meanes to come to perfection, that is charitie. And in the corps of the article in the end: *S. Thomas* alleadgeth *Moyses Abbot,* who as *Cassian* relateth sayed: *ieiunia, vigiliæ, meditatio Scripturarum, nuditas &c. fastinges, watchings, meditation of the Scriptures, nakednesse, and priuation of all riches, are noe perfection, but instruments of perfectiō, because in them consisteth not the end of that discipline* (to wit of a religious order) *but by them is attained the end.*

Hiero. in hūc locum Ambr. super illud Luc. 5. sequere me to. 5 cap. 3.

S. Thol. supra. Cassia. collat. 1. c. 7.

34. He contradicted also *Suarez* who sayeth that the counsailes, which are the actes of vertue practised

Suarez to. 3. l. 1. c 15. n. 12. ctiſed principallie in religion, and which *M. Nicholas* muſt eſpeciallie meane *by his actes of vertue*, are not perfection but inſtrumēts to attaine perfectiō. *Illa conſilia* (ſayeth he) *eorumque obſeruantia non continent formalem perfectionem ſed ſunt inſtrumenta ad illam acquirendam, ſine illis tamen poteſt inueniri perfectio: thoſe counſailes and their obſeruance, doe not containe formall perfection, but they are inſtruments to get it; yet without them perfection may be found.*

Suarez to. 3. l. 1. c. 4. 35. Yea *Suarez* denyeth that the perfection which a religious perſon intendeth, conſiſteth *in multitude, facilitie and continuation of actes of vertue*, as *M. Nicholas* would haue it, but ſayeth it conſiſteth not onely in charitie which is the eſſentiall perfection of a Chriſtian life and conſequentlie of a religious order; nor in any acte of charitie or other actes of vertue as *M. Nicholas* would make vs beleeue, but in an habituall promptitude and facilitie of louing God, and exerciſing other actes of vertue for the loue of God. For (ſayeth he) if this religious perfection conſiſted in actes, a religious man when he ſleepeth looſeth his perfection: for then he hath noe vſe of reaſon nor of any reaſonable actions. Onelie ſayeth he actes of charitie and other vertues pertaine to perfection antecedentlie, becauſe by them is gotten the aforeſayed habit and promptitude, and conſequentlie alſo becauſe they conſerue that promptitude, but in them conſiſteth not the perfectiō *intended to be gotten by a ſtate of perfectiō* as *M. Nicholas* ſayeth. Wherefore *M. Nicholas* not daring to ſtand conſtantlie to this,

this, addeth towards the end of this discourse in his 7. number, *or else in an habit, with particular reference to the sayed frequentation and continuation of such actes.*

M. NICHOLAS.

To all which we must adde that these aduantages are found in a religious life &c. n. 8. 9.

THE REPLY.

M. Nicholas *endeauours to preferre a religious state before that of a Bishop by reason of the aduantages of a religious life, of which the first is, the obseruation of the Counselles.*

36. If I would be as carping as *M. Nicholas* is against *M. Doctour*, I could tell him that *S. Thomas* 1. 2. *q.* 104. *ar.* 4. as he is cited in the margent by *M. Nicholas*, hath nothing of the Euangelicall counselles. Onely in his 108. *quest.* and 4. *artic.* he hath, and sayeth, that the Euangelicall counsailes are proper to the new law, which is true in respect of their perfection and vowes annexed to them in the new law, but yet they were obserued by the children of the Prophetes and others: and therefore *S. Hierom* sayeth: *filij Prophetarum quos monachos in veteri testamento legimus ædificabant sibi casulas prope fluenta Iordanis &c. The children of the Prophets whom we read to haue beene monkes in the old law, builded to themselues litle cotages nere to the riuers of Iordan &c.* And againe. *Nos autem habeamus propositi nostri principes Paules, Antonios, Hilariones Macharios, & vt ad Scripturarum auctoritatem redeam, noster Princeps Elias, noster Elisæus,* Ep. 4. ad Rusticum. Ep. 18. ad Paulã.

ſeus, noſtri filij Prophetarum: but let vs, haue as Princes of our Inſtitute thoſe Paules, Antonies, Hilarions, Machariouſes, and to returne to the authoritie of Scriptures, our Prince was Elias, ours Eliſeus, ours the children of the Prophetes.

37. *M. Nicholas* addeth. *and in this particular* (to wit of obſeruance of the three coũſailes, pouertie, chaſtitie, and obedience) *there appeares a maine difference betwixt a Religious man and a Bishop, who is not at all bound to pouertie, and to chaſtitie, he is obliged onely as other Prieſts by a vow annexed to holie orders.* If by this reaſon *M. Nicholas* will proue that a religious ſtate excelleth the ſtate of a Bishop, becauſe that ſtate hath the wow of chaſtitie annexed, this hath not; by the ſame reaſon he might proue that a ſimple Prieſt, yea a Deacon or Subdeacon hath an higher ſtate then a Bishop becauſe to the order of Subdeacon is annexed the vow of chaſtitie which is not annexed a new vnto the order of a Bishop. But let *Maiſter Nicholas* ſay as he pleaſeth, the Bishop is bound to keepe chaſtitie as much as the Prieſt, and although as *Suarez* ſayeth, he maketh not a new vow when he is conſecrated Bishop, yet becauſe he can not be a conſecrated Bishop vnleſſe he firſt receiue prieſthood, to which this vow is annexed, he cannot be a Bishop conſecrated without this obligation to keepe chaſtitie. And although this vow of chaſtitie be annexed to prieshoold by the law of the Church, which *M. Nicholas* addeth as though that did ſomething derogate

To 3. l. c 16. n 25.

to

to the Bishops ſtate; I anſwere that as the vow of chaſtitie which the religious maketh, proceedeth from his humane free will, yet after it is made, byndeth by the Diuine law; ſo although the vow of chaſtitie in a Prieſt, proceedeth originallie from the Churches law (and therefore the Greeke Prieſts may vſe their wiues they had before Prieſthood becauſe the Church byndeth not them to any ſuch vow) yet a Prieſt voweth freelie, for that he may chooſe whether he wilbe Prieſt or noe, and ſuppoſing that he voweth chaſtitie, his vow byndeth him by the Diuine law according to that. *Vouete & reddite: vow and render.* Pſ. 75.

37. Whereas *M. Nicholas* affirmeth that a Bishop elected yea and confirmed may marrie: I deny it. For, although (if he be not in holy orders) he hath made no vow of chaſtitie, yet (as *Innocẽtius* the third affirmeth) he that is elected and confirmed Bishop, cõtracteth a ſpirituall marriage with his Church which as *Suarez lib. 1. cap. 16. cit.* ſayeth byndeth by the Eccleſiaſticall, or as *Caietan.* and *Vaſquez to. 3. in 3 p. diſp. 2. & cap. 1. 3. 5. Caiet. 2. 2. q.* 184. *ar.* 6. thinke by the Diuine law; and ſo after he is confirmed, he cannot leaue his Church without the Popes leaue or diſpenſation. So after a ſimple vow of religion if one marrie he ſinneth but his marriage is valid. Nay a regular profeſſed by diſpenſation of the Pope, may of religious become no more religious and ſoe may marrie as cõmonlie the *Canoniſts*, & diuers Diuines do hold, And although *S. Thomas in 2. 2. q. 88. ar. 11. in Corp.* teacheth

Cap. inter corporalia de Tranſ. Epiſcopi. Suarez. Vaſq. Canon miſſi c. cum ap Mondo ſtatu monach. S Thom. Scotus

and Durād Rich. in 4.d. 38. Henr. de Gand. quod 5.q 28 Caiet. Leſſ. Caiet. Supra.

teacheth that the Pope cannot diſpenſe in aſolēne vow, yet *Caiet. 2.2.q.88.ar.11.* ſayeth, that this his opiniō proceedeth frō a miſtaking of the *Ch. Cū ad Monaſterium.* Wherefore we reade that diuers Popes haue diſpenſed with regulars profeſſed, to marrie, as may appeare by diuers examples related by *Caietan, Leſſius, l. 2. de voto c. 40. dubit. 14. nnm. 111.* and others. Yea, as Nauarre witneſſeth the *Commendators* of the militarie orders of S. Iames of *Alacantara* and *Calatraua*, are truely religious, and doe make the three vowes, but their vow of chaſtitie is onely of coniugall chaſtitie betwixt man and wife. And ſo their religion, though a true religious ſtate, admitteth Marriage. I graunt that ſome Diuines doe hold that theſe are not perfectlie but imperfectlie, and as they ſay *ſecundum quid* religious, but yet *Rodericus to. 1. q. 1. ar. 6. Fortunius.* *Burg. de Paz.* with *Nauar. trac. de Reddit. ibid.* and diuers others whom he citeth doe affirme them to be truelie religious, though militarie religious. Whereas the ſtate and order of a Bishop, conſecrated prieſt, Deacon and Subdeacon admitteth noe valid marriage.

Roder. Nau.

38. As for pouertie in which *M. Nicholas* ſayeth the regular excelleth the Bishop, becauſe he is not bound to pouertie. I anſwere with *S. Thomas 2.2. q. 184. ar. 7. ad. 1.* that the actuall abrenunciation and leauing of all riches is not perfection but an inſtrument and meanes to get perfection: and therefore a ſtate of perfection may be without this actuall leauing of all. But to leaue all in preparation of mind, ſo as that a man be prepared to leaue

S. Thomas.

all when the caſe happeneth that he muſt leaue all or offend God mortallie, is perfection: yea *S. Thomas* ſayeth: *& hoc pertinet directe ad perfectionē: and this pertaineth directlie to perfection*, becauſe this preparation includeth charitie, and the loue of God by which we are ſo diſpoſed that we are prepared rather to leaue all euen life it ſelfe, then to offend God mortallie. *Ad hoc autem* (ſayeth S. Thomas) *maximè tenentur Epiſcopi: quod omnia ſua pro honore Dei, & ſalute ſui gregis contemnant, cum opus fuerit, vel pauperibus ſui gregis largiendo, vel rapinam bonorum ſuorum cum gaudio ſuſtinendo: and to this Biſhops moſt of all are obliged, to contemne all for the honour of God and the health of their flocke when it ſhalbe needfull, either by giuing all to the poore, or by taking with ioy the ſpoyle of their goods.* *S. Th. 2. 2. q. 184. ar. 7. ad 1.* *Hebr.*

MAISTER NICHOLAS.

With theſe commodities proper to religious ſtate are to be ioyned twoe others of moſt important conſideration, of ſecuritie and immobilitie, wherein a regious ſtate exceedeth that of a Biſhop. n.9.

THE REPLY.

Of ſecuritie and immobilitie and whether the regular in them excelleth the Biſhop.

39. *M. Nicholas* would preferre a regular at leaſt in this particular reſpect of ſecuritie before the ſtate of a Biſhop. And I graunt that if the regular keepe his cloiſter and obſerue his rules, he is more ſeparated frō all occaſiōs of ſinne; but this as aboue I haue ſaied, argueth not, an higher or perfecter but a lower ſtate: for as the low ſhrubbe (as I ſaied

before) is leſſe shaken with wind aud tempeſts then the higher Cedars, ſo the lower the ſtate is the leſſe it is ſubiect to tentations, and dangers, & the higher it is the more dangerous it is, for that (as *S. Hierome* ſaith) *non eſt facile ſtare loco Pauli tenere gradum Petri: it is not easie to ſtand in the place of Paul, to hold the degree of Peter*: But as the ſtate of a Bishop by reaſon of the height of it, & the charge annexed to it, is more difficile and dangerous then the ſtate of a Regular; ſo his victorie ouer theſe difficulties, is more meritorious and glorious then the vertue of a Religious man by how much the religious hath leſſe and fewer difficulties to ouer come. *A certaine* holy and learned Abbot Philipp de Harueing aboue fowre hundered yeares agoe (whoſe workes were approued and printed in Doway) in his 99. *Chapt.* ſayeth the ſame in better words: for ſpeaking of the ſtates of a regular and a Paſtor, he deliuereth his conceite of this point in theſe words: *eſt ergo quanto facilius tanto ſecurius de medio fugere Babilonis & ſaluari: eſt autem quanto difficilius, tanto glorioſus in medio Babilonis victorem coronari: It is therefore, as much more easie, ſo much more ſecure, to fly out of the middeſt of Babilon* (the world) *as the regular doth and be ſaued: but it is ſo much the more glorious by how much the more difficile, to be crowned victour in the middeſt of Babilon*, as the good Bishop and Paſtour is. And S. *Auſtine* ſaieth, *that there is nothing in this life, and eſpeciallie this time, more easie and ioyfull and more acceptable to men thē the office of a Bishop, Prieſt or Deacon if the office be done negligentlie*

Hier. ſupra ep. ad Helio dorum

and for a fashion; ſed nihil apud Deum miſerius & triſtius, & damnabilius. But nothing before God more miſerable, ſadde, and damnable. Item nihil eſſe in hac vita & maximè hoc tempore, difficilius, laborioſius, periculoſius, ſi eo modo militetur quo noſter imperator iubet: And there is nothing in this life, eſpeciallie in this time, that is more hard more laborious more dãgerous thẽ the office of a Bishop, Prieſt or Deacon, if ſo we warre, as our Emperour commaundeth. And therefore *S. Chryſoſtome* ſaieth that *if you should bring vnto him a monke as good as Helias, yet he were not to be cõpared to him who being giuen* (as Paſtour) *to the people and cõpelled to beare the ſinnes of many, perſiſteth immoueable and ſtrong.* And the ſame Doctour cõſidering the difficultie & merit of the Bishops charge: *if one* (ſaith he) *should propoſe vnto mee where I had rather pleaſe* (God) *either in the Prieſtlie office that is of a Bishop or in the ſolitude of Monkes; without compariſon I would make choiſe of that I firſt ſpoake of.* And if the regular be ſent in miſſion to doe the functions of a Paſtour then he is in as greate danger as the Paſtour, & in ſo much the greater as mutations from one extreame to another are more dangerous. And therefore in the primatiue Church when regulars were ſent abroad into the world to preach or to take care of ſoules, they vſed to ſend none into the world, but ſuch as by long practiſe of humilitie, and mortification in a religious ſtate, were as dead to the world in affection as they were by profeſſion. But if *M. Nicholas* may make compariſons with the Bishop becauſe a regular

Ep. 14. Valer. Epiſc.

Chriſ. l. 6 de Sacerdotio.

gular is in greater ſecuritie, he may compare the inferiour regular with his Abbot and Generall, becauſe their ſtate as it is higher ſo it is leſſe free from danger, it being harder to gouerne others then ones ſelfe, and eaſier to rule one then many.

40. Now as concerning immobilitie, which is another aduantage that the regular, (as *M. Nicholas* affirmeth) hath of the Bishop, I anſwere with *Suarez* that when the Bishop accepteth the office of a Bishop in ſuch a Church, and is accepted of it, he maketh a pact and couenant with his Church to remaine with it, and to exerciſe Epiſcopall functions in it (to which ſaieth *Suarez* he is bound by charitie and iuſtice) and this is ſufficient to make the Bishop to haue a ſtate immoueable. Yet this immobilitie is augmented by the eccleſiaſticall law (as he thinketh) or euen by the diuine law, as *Vaſquez* affirmeth. And ſaieth *Suarez* a vow is not required to make a ſtate immoueable, becauſe, ſaieth he, a vow is not the totall cauſe of a ſtate. And whereas S. *Thomas* ſeemeth to require a vow annexed to the ſtate of the Bishop, he anſwereth with Caretan, that S. *Thomas* meaneth onely the aforeſayed pact, which the Bishop maketh with his Church when he accepteth it. And becauſe the Bishop is many times elected and confirmed Bishop of a place before he is conſecrated, he is alſo then in a ſtate of perfection, becauſe then he maketh a pacte and couenant with his Church & electours, neuer to leaue that Church without licence or diſpenſation of the Pope, with which

T. 3 li. 3. c 16. p. 23

Suarez & Vaſq ſupra.

S Th. 2. 2. q 184. ar. 5 8 & q. 185 ar. 4.

dispensation the religious may leaue his religious state and marrie, as aboue we haue shewed.

M. NICHOLAS.

Neither is this perfection of a religious state prostituted to the religious man alone but oftentimes disposeth him further to the helpeing of his neighbours &c. n. 10.

THE REPLY.

Regulars as regulars are by office to haue care of the soules of others.

41. Here *M. Nicholas* must be content to heare againe *M. Doctours* reduplication of Regulars as Regulars, for as Regulars they are not to haue care or charge of others but of their owne soules, to the perfecting whereof they endeauour: and therefore the regular state (as we haue seene) and as *M. Doctour* teacheth *Chap.* 12. is *status perfectionis acquirendæ, non exercendæ vel communicandæ*, a state of perfectiō to be gottē not to be exercised on others or to be cōmunicated vnto thē: & therefore saieth *S. Thomas* Bishops are in state of a perfectors of others, regulars are in state of them that are perfected. And so the regular state is to get perfectiō for ones selfe, the Bishops state is to communicate perfection to others by preaching, administration of Sacraments &c. Secondlie wee must distinguish betwixt the obligation which one hath of iustice and by office, and the obligation which is onely of charitie. By this second obligatiō not onely Pastours, but also others not Pastours are bound whē there is opportunitie, to haue care and to helpe their neighbour by fraternall correction, freindlie counsaile and exhortation. And by this obligation

S. Th. 2. 2. q. 184. ar. 7.

Ecc. c. 21. & 27. Mat. 18. of charitie, the religious when occasion occurreth are bound to helpe others. By the first obligation which is of office and iustice, onely Pastours and Superiours are bound to assist their neighbours & to tender their saluation. I graunt that the regular if he practise the counsailes well and obserue his rule exactlie, and exercise himselfe in actes of humilitie, patience, mortification frequentlie, doth remoue the impedimentes which hinder the loue of God, and so hath good meanes to encrease in himselfe the loue of God, and consequentlie of his neighbour, this loue being grounded in that: and so if he be called to preach, teache and minister Sacraments, his charitie will much helpe him yea moue and incite him to doe good to others: but this belongeth not to him precisely as he is a regular, for then it should belonge to all regulars euen lay brethren & wo men (for, as aboue I saied, *quod conuenit alicui quâ tali conuenit omni tali*) but as he is Priest and is called to doe the office of a Pastour, which office belongeth not to him, as due to the state of a regular, but (as *Suarez* sayeth in the words aboue alleadged) by priuiledge, by delegation and by participation. And therefore (sayeth *Suarez*) *the obligation of exercising such actions, and procuring the saluation of soules and loosing life for thē is farre greater & higher in a Bishop* (as it is also in an inferiour Pastour who also by office is to giue his life for his sheepe *Io.*10.) *thē in any whatsoeuer simple religious of what institute soeuer he be*, that is, although by his institute, he be to preach, teach, and minister Sacraments, as the Dominicans, Franciscans,

Suarez l.1.c 18 p.18.

& Iesuites are. And so when regulars haue beene sent to preach to infidelles (as many haue beene who also haue performed these functions with greate succesſe, as *M. Doctour*, confesſeth in his Hierarchie) they did these offices (as *Suarez* sayeth) by commission, delegation, and priuiledge, and not by any ordinarie right.

42. I graunt therefore that religious and some by their institute doe many of the functions of Pastours; for as Pastours do preach; so doe they; as Pastours doe minister Sacraments, so doe they at least some Sacraments: but in regulars this is accessorie, in Pastours principall; in regulars it is volũtarie, in Pastours necessarie; in regulars it is will and pleasure, in pastours obligatiõ; in regulars it is free offer, in Pastours boũden duty. Regulars assiste soules without charge or obligation to answere for thẽ; the pastours must answere soule for soule, yea for as many soules as he hath charge of: the regulars doth minister Sacraments sometimes and to those that come to them, Pastours in sommer & winter, by day and by night, in rayne and snow in heate and cold, must oftentimes goe to their penitentes howses, there to heare their confessions, there to minister vnto thẽ the B. Sacrament, there to giue them the last Sacrament: The regulars meddle not with Baptisme, marriage and extreme vnction, the Pastour ministreth all. In fine the Pastour with Iacob day and night is *parched with heate and forst*; and is by office vigilant and carefull for his sheepe that *the sleepe flyeth from his eyes*: and with the first workers in the vinyeard he beares *the burden of the day and heate*: Whereas the regular as

Cap. 8. n. 8.

Genes. 31. & Matth. 20.

they are the later workers, so they worke at pleasure. And as one saieth the Priests or Pastours of the Church, are the body of the armie, regulars are the ayding wings; Priests are prelled souldiers, regulars are voluntaries; Priests by office and ordinary right do minister Sacraments and preach, regulars only by priuiledge. And therefore *S. Denys* sayeth that because that the monkes when they were innitiated, did not kneele on both knees, nor had the Diuine bookes layed on their head, but were neere the Priests whilest he recited the prayer: *Declarat monachorum ordinis non esse alios deducere, sed in se ac per se stare in singulari sanctoq; statu.*

Lib de Eccl. Hier. c. 5. Contemplatio secundū vers. periotium.

M. NICHOLAS.

The perfection of a Bishop consists in this, that by his office he is obliged to enlighten others, and if occasion require to giue his life for his Flocke, which occasion seldome happeneth. To these two obligations, the Bishop is tyed by iustice in regard of maintenāce and honour afforded him by his flocke, or by vertue of fidelitie &c. but religious men meerelie vpō charitie or religion (more noble vertues then iustice or fidelitie) to illuminate others and venture their liues for the saning of soules. n. 11.

THE REPLY.

M. Nicholas *speaketh to baselie of the Bishops office and dutie.*

43. when I redde these words of *M. Nicholas* I confesse I noe litle wondered to heare a religious man, who should honour Bishops and Pastours, speake in this manner. But, speake truth, *M. Nicholas, & da gloriam Deo: giue glorie to God,* in giuing the due to his Bishop. Is not the Bishop also boūd, and especiallie bound, out of charitie to vndertake

and execute his office in illuminating and perfecting others, and in giuing his life for thē? If he be not; why did Christ three times demaund of S. Peter *whether he loued him*, before he would cōmitte the gouernement of the Church vnto him? Doe not those words of our Sauiour *a good shepheard* giueth his life for his sheepe, pertaine especially & more principallie to Bishops (yea and to inferiour Pastours) then to regulars? *Suarez* a regular as well as *M. Nicholas*, and farre more learned and modest in the place last alleadged, sayeth *that the obligation of exercising actions* (ordained to the perfecting of others) *and the procuring the saluation of soules, and loosing life for them*, is farre *greater and higher in a Bishop, then in any whatsoeuer simple religious, of what Institute soeuer hee be.* And is there any *greater charitie* then to expose ones life for his sheepe as the Bishop is bound? confesse then, *M. Nicholas*, to the honour of God (who is honored in his Bishops) that the obligation which the Bishop hath to illuminate others, & to giue his life for thē, is greater thē any regular hath, vnlesse he be also a Bishop or Pastour. Yea (as aboue we haue sayed) it belongeth not to regulars as regulars to illuminate others, or to giue their liues for them (for then they should be *in statu perfectionis acquisitæ & exercendæ*) but onlie to seeke to saue and perfect themselues. And *M. Nicholas* (see how partiall affection domineereth sometimes euen in Religious men) when he sayeth *that a Bishop is tyed to illuminate others and to giue his life for his flocke by iustice only in regard of his maintenance, and by fidelitie in regard of his couenant made with his flocke, and that regulars meerelie out of*

Ioan. 21.

Ioan. 10.

Lib. 1. c. 18. n. 14.

charitie expose themselues to dangers for gaining of soules, as he commendeth partiallie regulars, so he derogateth no litle to all Bishops in making thē all in a māner mercenaries, which kind of Pastours Christ discōmēdeth & reiecteth. For that the mercenarie takes care of the flock not for the sheepes good & loue of them, but for his owne interest to wit, *honour, maintenance*, and lucre, as *M. Nicholas* seemeth to say all Bishops doe. And so regulars are only the good Pastours *who meerely vpon charitie and religion doe illuminate others, and aduenture their life for sauing of soules.* wherefor as all Bishops ought to accept their office principallie for the loue of God and zeale of soules, so we must haue that charitable opinion of them, as to thinke that they doe so. *Suarez* speaketh more honorablie of the charitie of the Bishop. *Tertiò desideratur maximè in Episcopo charitas, tum in Deum qui est principalis ouium Dominus, vt significauit Christus Ioan. 21. cum ter interrogauit Petrum an se diligeret priusquam illi oues suas commendaret &c.* Thirdlie (saieth he) *there is required most of all in a Bishop charitie as well towards God who is the principall Lord of the sheepe, as Christ signified Ioa. 21. when three times he demaunded of Peter whether he loued him, before he commended vnto* him his sheepe; as also towards his subiectes, *whom he must tolerate, receiue beinglie, patiētlie suffer & releiue their necessities, and serue thē according to that of S. Paul 1. Cor. 9. I made my selfe the seruāt of all that I might gaine the moe.* And after: *To the weake I became weake, that I might gaine the weake.* And finallie he is bound in a particular māner by vertue of his office, so to loue his sheepe,

Suarez c. 18. n. 4.

as to yeeld his life for thē (if so it must be as Christ taught Ioan. 10. Whence it is that patience is necessarie for him, which hath a perfect worke, because hee must not onely obserue mercie, but also iustice, & that sometymes stoutly and seuerelie. Whence also it must needs be, that he must suffer many thinges of the naughtie. For these causes therefore and the like, the Episcopall throne is a place of greatest perfection. Thus, and thus farre *Suarez*.

44. Whereas *M. Nicholas* addeth *n.* 12. that merit doth not consist in office, *but in actes thereof*. I must tell him that though merit cōsist not in office only, yet there is greate merite in executing a lawfull & holy office, such as is the office of the Priest & Bishop, & the greater the state, office, and dignitie is, the greater is the merit in executing it. And *M. Nicholas* cannot deny, but that the state & dignitie of the person addeth merit to his actions. For as the regulars actions by reason of his state and vow, are more meritorious then are the same actiōs done by other Christiās not regulars: so not onely the Bishops actions proper to his state, are of greater perfection and merit then the proper actions of regulars: but also the same actions done by a regular & a Bishop, are more meritorious in a Bishop thē in a regular. For as *M. Nicholas* knoweth the dignitie of the person dignifieth the operation, & therefore Christ his operations were of infinite merit and satisfaction, because his person and state of the naturall sonne of God, was infinite.

45. And now one would thinke that *M. Nicholas* had made an end of his (I feare) too odious comparisons of the state of a regular with the state of a Bishop: but it seemeth he hath reserued the most

odious to the laſt place, for that in the ſame 12. num-
ber immediatlie after the words alleadged, he cal-
leth the world to witneſſe whether the regulars
haue not more enlightned, it thē ſecular Paſtours.
Theſe are his words. *Let the whole worlds experience decide whether the ſecular Paſtours or Religious men doe in fact enlighten mankind, by preaching, teaching, filling libraries with learned volumes, reducing heretikes through out Europe and conuerting iafidelles in both the Indies, Iaponia, China &c.* To this his compariſon I anſwere firſt, that I grant that manie countries haue beene conuerted by religious men, as Englād by S. Auſtine and his Fellow Monkes, Germanie by S. Boniface and other religious mē. And in this laſt age the Ieſuites are famous for the conuerſion of Infidelles in Iaponia, China and other Coūtries, and amongſt them S. Xauier was the chiefe. But *M. Nicholas* muſt grant that by the Apoſtles who were Biſhops and Prieſts, and cānot be proued out of Scripture to haue beene properly religious, & by many of their ſucceſſors not religious, many countries haue beene reduced to the Chriſtiā faith. Secōdlie I anſwere that though it be moſt true that many coūtries haue beene conuerted by religious, ſo for *M. Nicholas* to braue all ſecular Paſtours vnder whom are cōprehended Biſhops & Popes, is to bold a compariſon. Thirdly I anſwere that regulars did not as regulars nor as Abbots or Priors which are Titles of their religious ſtate, conuert theſe countries, but as Prieſts and Biſhops and Popes which are Titles of the Clergie. To that which *M. Nicholas*, addeth *n.* 13. concerning the ſtate of religiō which tēdeth to perfectiō, & of the Biſhop

hop which ſuppoſeth perfection, & therefore perfecteth others, I haue anſwered him fullie in the beginning of this queſtion.

M. NICHOLAS.

Now as for the ſecond compariſon of religious men with inferiour Paſtours &c. n. 14.

THE REPLY.

M. Nicholas *hath had no ſucceſſe in comparing Regulars with Biſhops.*

46. *M. Nicholas* in his compariſon of Regulars with Biſhops (as the Reader will eaſilie ſee) hath had noe great good ſucceſſe: for whereas *M. Doctour*, cõpared ſtate with ſtate, and in ſtate preferred the Biſhop: hee, ſeing the Regular in this compariſon to come farre ſhort of the Biſhop, hath changed, yea left the queſtion, and hath had recourſe to ſome commodities and good meanes which are to be found in a religious ſtate, as ſecuritie frõ danger meanes to attaine to mortification and perfection, and now he commeth to compare the ſtate of regulars with that of inferiour paſtours: and before I ſhall firſt ſpeake of the ſtate of inferiour Paſtours, and out of that I ſhall ſay of it, I ſhall anſwere to all *M. Nicholas* alleageth againſt them.

Of the ſtate of Prieſts and Paſtours inferiour to Biſhops.

47. *M. Doctour*, becauſe he would not ſeeme in any wiſe to contradict *S. Thomas*, had granted to the religious a perfecter ſtate by reaſon of immobilitie which *S. Thomas* requireth to a ſtate, then to inferiour paſtours who may leaue their paſtourships and enter into religion; and he contented himſelfe

S.Th. 2.2. q.184. a.8. M.D. in his Hier. c.11.n. n.14. to giue only to these Pastours a perfecter office & calling, the office of gouerning soules (which was the office of Christ and his Apostles) farre surpassing: and so M. *Nicholas* might haue spared this labour; but seing that he moueth this comparison, as making himselfe Cocke sure that regulars are of a more perfect state thē they. I shall shew what probability there is for the preferring of these pastours before Religious. And least I may be esteemed partiall, I shall say litle in this point which *Suarez* doth not auouch. And for a better & easier entrāce into this matter it will not be amisse, if a certaine distinctiō of *S. Thomas* be premised. For (saieth he) in a secular Pastour we may cōsider three things, to wit, that he is secular (in which consideration, he agreeth with lay men) that he is a Priest, and that he hath charge and care of soules. So in a regular Priest wee may cōsider that he is a regular, that he is priest, and that he hath care and charge of soules. In the first the regular excelleth the secular; and no meruaile, for in that consideration he agreeth with a lay Christian, who in state is euer inferiour to a regular. In the other two considerations, to wit in regard of Priesthood and charge of soules, the regular Priest and Pastour on the one side, & the secular Priest and Pastour on the other side, are equall. The question is whether a regular not Priest, be in an higher state of perfection then the secular Priest or Pastour.

Suarez to.3.l. 1.c.17. & 21. S.Th. 2.2.q. 184. ar.8.in corp.

47. And if we speake of the secular Priest who is only Priest & hath no charge of soules, he no douht by vertue of his Priestlie order and caracter is in an higher state and dignitie then any Regular not

Prieſts, Becauſe the Prieſts ſtate is immoueable by reaſon if his indelible Caracter, which by no ſinne, by noe degradation can be taken from him. By his order and caracter he hath power to conſecrate the ſacred body and bloud of Chriſte, and to offer them in Sacrifice; and by the ſame caracter he hath power to abſolue from ſinnes ſo that the Pope or Church giue him compleate Iuriſdiction or apply ſubiectes vnto him, as *M. Doctour* hath in his Hierarchie declared: Which power alſo (as in the ſame Treatiſe is showē) is the greateſt power that is in the Church of God and greater then any Angell hath. And if ſtates be meaſured by their actions and operations to which they are ordained (as they muſt) then is the ſtate of a ſimple Prieſt greater then any regular or whatſoeuer other ſtate excepting the ſtate of a Bishop, which includeth this power and is greater for it then for any other power; becauſe by this power he with the Prieſt hath power ouer the natural body of Chriſte by cōſecrating it, by his other power of abſoluing from ſinnes (which the Prieſt alſo hath) and by his power to ordaine miniſters and to confirme, he hath only power ouer the myſticall body of Chriſte, which is his Church. And therefore by how much the naturall body of Chriſte deified with the Diuinitie ſurpaſſeth the myſticall body, the Churche: by ſo much, pro-

Chap. 6. nu. 11. & ch. 12. nu. 6.

portionably, the power of conſeerating which the Prieſt hath, ſurpaſſeth the power of abſoluing, ordayning and confirming. And this Suarez graunteth, ſo doth Valentia, who ſayth, *That if in inferiour Prelates. We conſider the degree of holy order, then ſpeaking abſolutelie there is ſome thing more worthie and more perfect in them, then in religious as they are religious, and not alſo initiated with holy orders.* Where by the way I note, that he vſeth *M. Doctours* reduplication (as religious) which ſo much offendeth *M. Nicholas*: and this no man can deny. This holy order of Prieſthood in which is grounded this power, requireth (as *S. Thomas* ſaith) of a Prieſt greater ſanctitie then the regulars ſtate requireth of him, and for that cauſe alſo (ſaith *S. Thomas*) the ſame acte of ſinne in a Prieſt by reaſon of his holy order, is greater then in a Religious man, not Prieſt. The ſtate of a Prieſt is ſo high ād holy, that many, though religious haue feared to vnder goe it as *S. Antonie*, *S. Benedict* and *S. Francis*; yea *S. Hiereme* though a great ſaincte, Religious, and learned, did ſo at lengh permitte himſelfe to be ordained Prieſt, that as Baronius obſerueth he neuer receiued any Title or charge of any Church ſaying, *That it is not an eaſie thing to ſtand in Paules place, and to holde the degree of Peter*: And therefore wisheth, *That it may be farre from him to ſpeake ill of Prieſts who ſucceeding to the Apoſtles, doe conſecrate the body of Chriſte, and*

Suarez lib. 1. c. 17 nu. 2. Valen. 2. 2. diſp. 10. q. 2. De ſtatu epiſt. punto 1.

S. Th. 2. 2. q. 184. a. 8. in Corp. Baro. anno Chris. 378. in fine. Hier. ep. ad Helio.

Iudge

Iudge vs before the later daye, and by whom we are made Christians.

47. For these and the like reasons there wante not as Suarez, out of Antoninus and Augustinus de Ancona relateth, who affirme that a simple Priest is in an higher state then a Regular not Priest. And although *S. Thomas* as we haue seen, Caietan and others are of opinion, that simple Priests are not in a state of perfection, becausse Priests, if we except the vow of chastitie, are by their ordination bound to noe workes of supereregation or Counselles, but onlie to keepe the commandements, though by reason of their sacred order, more sanctitie be required of them, then of other Christians, and if they sinne, their sinne (if other circumstances be alike) is greater then the like sinne in others: yet for the reasons alleaged, the state of a Priest by Reason of his eminent and sacred functiõs, exceedeth in that respect the state of all Religious not Priests whatsouer. *Suar. l. 1. c. 17. n. 2 Anto. 3. p. in prolog. §. 4. & S. Aug. de Ancon. l. de Potest. eccl. q. 26. a. 1.*

48. Suarez concludeth this point in these words: *Quapropter censeo Sacerdotes ex vi sui ordinis habere statum altiorẽ & sanctiorem, qui ab eis nonnulla perfectionis opera requirit, ratione cuius obligationis, merito dici possunt, esse aliquo modo, saltem inchoatiuè, in statu perfectionis.* Wherefore I thinke that Priests by vertue of their order, haue a state higher and holyer, which requireth of them certaine *L. 1. cit. c. 17. n. 4. in fine.*

taine workes of perfection, by reaſon of which obligation, they worthily may be ſayd to be in ſome manner, in a ſtate of perfection, at leaſt inchoatiue, that is imperfectlie, and in a certaine beginning. And a litle before he ſaith that the diuerſitie of opinions in this thing is rather in the manner of ſpeaking then in the thing it ſelfe: as indeede it ſeemeth to bee. For if we vnderſtand by a ſtate of perfection, a ſtate which is immoueable (as the Prieſts is by reaſon of the Carracter) and which is ordained to high and excellent functions and which therefore requireth ſãctitie of the Prieſt, and maketh his ſinnes the greater; then the ſtate of a ſimple Prieſt is higher then any regulars ſtate is: but if we vnderſtand by a ſtate of perfection, a ſtate that is bound to workes of ſuperogatiõ, ſuch as are the workes of the thre Counſelles, pouertie, chaſtitie, and obediẽce, then the Prieſts ſtate is not in that ſẽſe a perfect ſtate of perfection, becauſe chaſtitie excepted, he is not bound to the Counſailes and workes of ſupererogation, which are inſtrumentes by which perfection is attained. But yet, as notwithſtãding that the Bishop is not obliged to ſuch workes of ſupererogatiõ for neither is he bound to pouertie nor to obedience to any but the Pope: and yet by *S Thomas* and all mens opiniõ is in an higher State of perfection then the Regular, by reaſon that his ſtate is ſo immoueable, that he cannot

cannot leaue his Church without licence of the Pope, and he is by his ſtate obliged to more eminent functions and greater charitie (which is to die for his sheepe) ſo the Prieſt becauſe his ſtate is immoueable by his caracter, and is ordained to higher functions, as the conſecrating of Chriſtes body, offering of the dreadfull and vnbloudie ſacrifice, abſoluing from ſinne, if he haue cõpleate Iuriſdictiõ: may ſeeme to be in an higher ſtate then a Regular not Prieſt.

49. Now as concerning Paſtours inferiour to Bishops who are not onlie Prieſts but alſo haue charge of ſoules: it ſeemeth more probable that they are in a ſtate of perfection higher and perfecter then the ſtate of a Regular not Paſtour. And this is affirmed by Gerſon, Henricus de Gandauo, and Maior, whom Suarez in the ſame chapter alleageth; and thus they proue their opinion: becauſe they by their office are bound to workes verie perfect, to wit to miniſter Sacraments, to preach and to gouerne ſoules which is *the arte of artes*, and to take care and charge of them, to perfect, illuminate and purge them, and to yeeld (when the occaſion is offered) their liues for them. To which actions, Regulars not Paſtours are not ordained or obliged. This the aforeſayd authours confirme, becauſe the diſciples whom Chriſte ſent two and two to preache, were in a ſtate

Gerſ. trac. de ſtatu perfect. alphab. 67. l. v. 3 p. Hẽric. quod. 12. q. 28 & 29. Maior. in 4 d. 34. q. 7. Suarez c. 17. n. 5.

of perfection next to the Apoſtles: but Paſtours ſucceed to them, as Bishops doe to the Apoſtles: *Ergo* they are in a ſtate of perfection and next to the ſtate of Bishops. And for this (to wit that inferiour Paſtours ſucceed to the diſciples) Suarez citeth *S. Clements* firſt Epiſtle, againſt which more is obiected then againſt the 4. Epiſtle alleaged by *M. Doctour*. Theſe arguments may ſeeme much to vrge for a ſtate of perfection in inferiour Paſtours.

S. Th. 2 2. q. 184. a. 7.

50. Yet *S. Thomas* whoſe authoritie is great not onlie in the Schoole, but alſo in the Church, affirmeth that Curates are not in a ſtate of perfection, becauſe to a ſtate is required immobilitie, which is not in a Curate or inferiour Paſtour, becauſe he hath no vow to tye him to that ſtate, but may leaue it, if he will goe to Religion, without the Bishops licence, yea againſt his will as *S. Thomas* prooueth out of Pope Vrban: wheras the Religious by reaſon of his vowe cannot forſake his ſtate of life. To this Suarez anſwereth, that if *S. Thomas* require a proper vowe to make a ſtate, then the Bishops ſtate ſhould not bee a perfect ſtate, becauſe when he is made Bishop he maketh no vowe: But if by a vow he meane a pact, conuenant, or mutual promiſe betwixt him and his Church, ſuch a promiſe or pact is to be found in the Paſtour, as well as in the Bishop.

S. Th. Sup. q. 2. cap. due ſunt.

Suar l. 1. c. 17. ſup. pra.

51. Caie-

51. Caietan (ſayth Suarez) anſwereth, that the inferiour Paſtour hath not a diuine commandement to ſtick to his Paſtourſlip, nor any humane precept, becauſe none can be alleaged: To whom Suarez replyeth that nether the Bishop by any diuine law is tyed to his Bishopricke, (though Vaſquez in this cõtradicteth him, as aboue we haue ſeene) only by the Eccleſiaſticall lawe he is wedded to his Bishopricke, and by this lawe, the inferiour Paſtour alſo is wedded to his Paſtourship. It is true that the inferiour Paſtour may enter into Religion without the Popes or Bishops leaue, as S. Vrban affirmeth in the place alleaged, yet, as Suarez aſſureth vs, that is no ſigne that he is not in a ſtate with obligation ſufficient to ſtick to it, but onlie that his obligation is not abſolute, but includeth this cõdition, to wit, ſo that he aſcend not to an higher or ſecurer ſtate. For ſo alſo a religious man profeſſed in a laxer religion, hath a ſtate, yet he may leaue it to enter into a ſtricter Religion as the canons doe teach vs. But vnleſſe the Archdeacon or inferiour Paſtour enter into Religion, he cannot leaue his office or Paſtorship without licence of the Pope or Bishop, as may appeare by diuers textes of the canon lawe. And this (ſayth Suarez) *S. Thomas* ſuppoſeth when he ſayth that an Archdeacon or Curate may leaue his Church by the licence of the Bishop, inſinua-

19. q. 2. cap. dua ſunt. Suar. l. 1. c. 17. n. 9.

Cap. ſanè & ca. licet de regular. Cap. admonet. de renunciat. & ca.

Si quis verò. & ca. Episcopus de loco 17. q. 1.

nuating that otherwiſe he cannot. It is true that the Bishop hath a greater obligatiõ to ſtick to his Bishoppricke becauſe he cãnot forſake it without diſpenſation or leaue from the Pope; the inferiour Paſtour may leaue his Paſtorship with licence of the Bishop. but the reaſon of this may bee, becauſe the Bishop hath noe Superiour but the Pope to licẽce him, the inferiour Paſtour hath the Bishop who may diſpenſe with him. To which may be added, that the Pope hĩſelfe who hath the higheſt ſtate in the Church, may renoũce it, and yet becauſe he cannot do this without great and vrgent cauſe, he is in a ſtate of perfection. Wherefore becauſe the Curate or Archdeacon cannot leaue their charges without licence of the Bishop, their ſtate is morallie immoueable, becauſe that which we can not doe without diſpenſation of the Superiour is counted to vs morallie impoſsible. And ſo the ſtate of an inferiour Paſtour is morallie immoueable and vnchaungeable and ſo in that reſpect wanteth nothing required to a ſtate. And that their ſtate is an higher and perfecter ſtate, it may be proued, becauſe Paſtours euen inferiour to the Bishop are in a ſtate of perfection to bẽ exerciſed and cõmunſcated to others, the regular is in a ſtate of acquiring or tending to perfection; and ſo the Paſtours ſtate (though in an inferiour manner) is as the Bishops ſtate is, to

wit a

wit a ſtate of Illuminators, the regulars is of thoſe that are illuminated; the Paſtours ſtate is of perfectors, the regulars ſtate is of thoſe that are perfected, that ſtate is of maſters, this of Schollers, that of Agentes this of patients. And ſo that the perfecter ſtate, this the leſſe perfect.

52. For as S. *Auſtine* ſayth, the Agent (in that reſpect) is more noble then the patient: and therefore the ſoule or ſpirit is more noble then the bodye, that being the Agent this the patient. And we ſee that the Sunnes office in illuminating is more noble then the ayres condition in being illuminated, the fiers in heating then the waters in being heated, the maiſters in teaching, then the Schollers in being taught. And as *S. Thomas* out of *S. Denis* ſayth, that *Pontificum ordo conſummatiuus eſt & perfectiuus, ſacerdotum autem illuminatiuus*: *the order of Bishops is conſummatiue and perfectiue, the order of Prieſts illuminatiue*; *ſo the order* of inferiour Paſtours is illuminatiue and perfectiue: and as hee ſayth that the ſtate of a Regular is compared to the Epiſcopal ſtate as diſcipline to Magiſterie, and as a diſpoſition to perfection; ſo the ſame may be ſayd of inferiour Paſtours in their degree, for that they are in ſtate not of Schollers but of maiſters and perfecters. hence it is that *S. Iſidore* ſayth: *Sacerdotibus ſicut Epiſcopis diſpenſatio myſteriorum Dei commiſſa eſt*: *præſunt enim Eccleſiæ, & in*

Aug. l. 12. de gen ad lit. c. 16. S. Th. 22. q. 84. a. 6. in arg. Sed contra Dionyſ. l. de Eccleſ. Hier. c. 5. S. Th. 2. 2. q. 185 art. 8. Iſidor. l 2. de diuinis officijs. c. 7.

& in confectione diuina corporis & ſanguinis, conſortes cũ Epiſcopo ſunt, ſimiliter in doctrina Populorũ & in officio prædicationis: *To Prieſts, as to Biſhops the diſpenſation of the myſteries of God is committed: for that they beare rule in the Church, and in the diuine conſecration of the body and bloud of Chriſte, they are conſorts with the Biſhop, likewiſe in teaching of the people, and in the office of preaching.* And the Councell of Trent ſayth *That to all to whom the care of ſoules is committed, it is commanded by the diuine commandement, to know their sheepe, to offer for them the ſacrifice, and to feed them by preaching of the word of God, adminiſtration of ſacraments, and by example of good workes.*

S. Th. 2.2.q 184. *ar.* 6. *ad* 2. 53. But Suarez obiecteth againſt inferiour Paſtours out of *S. Thomas*, that Archdeacons and inferiour Paſtour haue but vnder-adminiſtrations vnder the Bishop, and are to the Bishop as Bayliues are to the Prince. And Caietan cited by Suarez ſayth, the Paſtoral office, and obligation to yeeld ones life for the sheepe pertaineth principally to Biſhops, and onlie ſecũdarilie and miniſteriallie to inferiour Paſtours, and that Curates and vnder Paſtours doe vndertake the care of ſoules as Miniſters and Officiales of the Biſhops, who are the principal agentes, and ſo are not in a ſtate, but Miniſters and Officiales of the Biſhops, who onelie are in ſtate of perfection to be exerciſed on others. But Suarez anſwereth verie well, that Curates are not inſtru-

a. 2. & 20.

ſtruments', Officialles, or delegates of the Bishops, but are trulie Paſtours comprehended vnder the name of *Proprius Sacerdos* to whom euerie Chriſtian of ſufficient age is bound to confeſſe once a yeare. And although the Bishop hath greater and more ample authoritie then the inferiour Paſtors haue, yet they are not Officialles nor miniſters, nor in inſtrumental cauſes in reſpect of the Bishop but true and ordinarie Paſtours though both, they and the Bishop alſo, be miniſters and inſtrumentall cauſes in reſpect of Chriſte. And although (ſaith Suarez) the Bishop be in an higher ſtate, yet that hindereth not, but that Curats alſo be in a ſtate though inferiour: for ſo though all religious orders be in ſtates of perfection, yet one is a perfecter ſtate then another. Out of all this which for the moſt parte is grounded in Suarez, it ſeemeth verie probable, that inferiour Paſtours haue not onlie an higher and perfecter office (which *S. Thomas* inſinuateth ſaying that they rather haue an office pertaining to perfectiō then a ſtate of perfectiō) but alſo an higher ſtate of perfection: their ſtate being of perfection to be exerciſed, not to be acquired as the Regulars ſtate is, and being ordained to higher actions and functions, and they making a pacte and conuenant with their Church as Bishops doe, which in a Bishop (as Suarez confeſſeth) cauſeth an immobilitie.

Cap. omnis vtriuſque ſexus de pœnit. & remiſſ.

Supra n. 28.

S. Th. 2.2. q. 184. a. 6. ad 3.

54. Where-

l. 1. c. 2. n. 5. 54. Wherefore Suarez at length concludeth, that the ſtate of Inferiour Paſtours and Regulas doe exceed and are exceeded of one another in diuerſe reſpects; for ſayth hee if wee demaund which ſtate is more profitable to ones ſelfe, leſſe daungerous, and more ſure, then the Religious ſtate in this reſpect taketh the precedence: but if you demaund *n. 6.* which ſtate contineth, *Maius Dei obſequium, greater ſeruice of God, & perfectiora opera ex genere ſuo requirit; and requireth more perfect operations of their kind*, then, ſayth hee, the ſtate of theſe inferiour Paſtours is in it ſelfe and of it ſelfe perfecter then the ſtate of a Religious man. And in this ſorte ſpeculatiuelie it may be graũted that the Paſtoral ſtate is perfecter *S. Th. in c. 5. Mat.* then the Regular ſtate, and this *S. Thomas* vpon *S. Matthew*, ſeemeth to fauour as Suarez confeſſeth.

55. And ſo wheras *M. Nicholas nu. 14.* proueth that a Regular ſtate is perfecter then the ſtate of an inferiour Paſtour, becauſe a Paſtour may enter into Religion without diſpenſation: his argument proueth onely that a Regulars ſtate is more ſure for ones *S. Th. 2. 2. q 184. 7. arg. ſed cõtra.* owne ſaluation, and ſo may be elected and vowed, but not that it is an higher or perfecter ſtate. I graunt that *S. Thomas* proueth that a Religious ſtate is inferiour to the ſtate of a Bishop, becauſe a Religious man may become a Bishop, and his argument is good. Becauſe a Re-

a Religious man cannot accept of a Bishops office becauſe it is more ſure, as is manifeſt, and therefore if he may accept of it, it muſt be becauſe it is a perfecter ſtate. But an inferiour Paſtour may vndertake the ſtate of a Regular not becauſe it is more perfect (as Azorius Regular confeſſeth) but becauſe in it he may more ſurelie ſaue his owne ſoule which he may preferre before the ſoule of others, charitie firſt tendring ones owne ſaluation and ſo although the inferiour Paſtour doth thus deſcend in ſtate yet he doth not properlie *Retrocedere* nor *Retroſpicere* goe backe or looke backe becauſe he thus auaunceth his owne ſaluatiō. And ſo it is a good argument. A regular may be a Bishop ergo a Bishops ſtate is perfecter: but is not a good argument: an Inferiour Paſtour may be a Religious man, ergo a Religious man hath a perfecter ſtate; but only ergo a Religious man hath a more ſecure ſtate.

Azor. to. 1. l. 11. ca. 24.

56. But in a controuerſie ſo much diſputed, and wherin to giue ſentēce, may prouoke the one partie or the other, I will leaue the Iudgement thereof to the Iudicious Reader who by what is ſaid for inferiour Paſtours, will peraduenture Iudge it more probable that inferiour Paſtours should worthilie be preferred in ſtate of perfection. And as *M. Nicholas Pag.* 103. *Num.* 7. referreth his reader to Platus a Regular concerning the Regular ſtate:

ſtate: So will I (and with leſſe exception) referre him to one *Philippe de Harueing* a Regular and learned Abbot concerning the Clergie and all Paſtours euen inferiour.

57. This man was Abbot of a Monaſterie called *Bona Spes*, *Good Hope* and he wrote aboue fowre hundred and fiftie yeares agoe. His workes were printed in Doway in the yeare M. DC. XX. and approued by Doctour Colvenerius Chauncelour of the Vniuerſitie, and Cenſor of Bookes in that Vniuerſitie. He in his worke *De Dignitate, Scientia, Iuſtitia, & Continentia Clericorum*, commendeth highlie Regulars (amongſt whom he was verie eminent,) yet in euery chapter almoſt, he preferreth the Clergie, I will (for breuities ſake) cite only a fewe paſſages. In his 17. Chapter he ſayth, as *M. Nicholas* will not ſaye; *Noſtrum eſt nouiſſimum locum eligere, nec ad altiora volatu præſumptuoſo nos ipſos erigere*: *It is our parte* (that is the part of Religious) *to chooſe the laſt place and not by a preſumptuous flight to eleuate our ſelues to higher things*. In his 17. Epiſtle he ſayth that from all the bounds and
» limits of the earth, all ãtiquitie did euer extoll
» the Clericall order, and euer gaue it amongſt
» the other orders, the principall ranke and de-
» gree, and though by the diuine diſpoſition a
» ſoldier or Ruſtique doe excell in ſanctitie,
» yet the Clergie man in excellencie of Eccle-
ſiaſtical dignitie: and although the Clergie

man

man, as we doe ſometimes, decline to wordlie things and *To the weake and poore elements*, yet their order declineth not in authoritie. In his 84. chapter he ſayth, that the Bleſſed *S. Benedict* founded many Monaſteries, and inſtructed and informed many monks by the good and holſome documents he left to poſteritie, and is not read to haue been Prieſt: yet wanted not perfectiõ of a monke, nor did he think it any diſparagement to his monaſticall inſtitute, that his monkes should not cõtend to excell others in holy orders, but in holy manners, conſidering that the promotion to orders maketh not a monke, but abiection and vilifying of ones ſelfe, labour, ſilence, diſcipline, reſt, Religion. And in his 99. chapter: *Habeant ſibi maiorem monachi ſanctitatem, relinquentes Clericis maiorem humiliter dignitatem: Let monkes keepe to themſelues greater ſanctitie, leauing humblie to Clergie men greater dignitie.* And in his 98. and 97. Chapters, he ſayth that *S. Hierome* did therefore inuite *Heliod. Paulinus*, and *Ruſticus* to be mõkes, not becauſe he thought more baſelie of the Clergie, but becauſe he eſteemed their ſtate, as more worthie, ſo not ſo ſecur, and therefore (ſayth hee) *S. Hierome* wished it might be farre frõ hĩ to ſpeake euillie of Prieſts who ſucceeding to the Apoſtolicall degree, doe conſecrate with their owne wouth the body of Chriſt, by whom we are Chriſtians, who hauing in their cuſto-

Pag. 462.

cuſtodie the Keyes of heauen, doe Iudge vs in a mãner before the daye of Iudgement, As if he should haue ſaied: *eos quorũ gradus tantæ eſt in Eccleſia dignitatis, quorum officiũ tantæ eſt ſanctitatis non audeo inferiores monachis iudicare, quamuis eos videã in vrbibus habitare &c.* thoſe, whoſe degree is of ſuch dignitie in the Churche, whoſe office is of ſo great ſanctitie, I dare not iudge inferiour to monkes although I ſee, they dwelle in Cities. But other is (ſayth S. Hierom) the cauſe of a monke, other is the cauſe of Clarkes. Clarckes do feed the sheep, I am feede That is to ſaie, vs, who are fedde noe cauſe vrgeth to beare the moleſtations of the popular tumult, which to tolerate the Clarcke is compelled by Paſtoral neceſſitie: yet is not he therefore eſteemed inferiour: Yea ſoe much more worthier the Clarcke is iudged then a monke by how much the Paſtour is worthier then the sheepe. But how much more worthier place the Clarck obteineth, by ſo much it is more neceſſarie that he be of holier life: leaſt if the greater dignitie want the greater ſanctitie; the Clarcke may take the greater detriment by his greater dignitie. But becauſe it is rare to ſtand with an vndeclining ſanctitie, and to auoyd that (mortal ſinne) I doe not Counſaile thee (thus he maketh S. Hieron to ſpeake) to aſcend to an higher place leaſt thou ſtand not, and find a greater ruine. It is not (ſayth he) eaſie to ſtand in the place of Paule nor to hold the degree of Peeter. And in his hundreth chapter alleaging that ſentence out of S. Auſtine: Nimis dolendum ſi ad tam ruinoſam ſuperbiam

pag. 453. Aug. ep. 76 ad Aurel.

perbiam monachos ſurrigamus &c. cum aliquando etiam bonus monachus vix bonum clericum faciat: it is much to be lamented if we eleuate monkes to ſuch rumous pride, and think Clarkes, in whoſe number weare, worthy ſo great a contumelie, wheras ſometimes alſo a good Monke ſcarſelie maketh a good Clark; This Authour Philip de Haruing addeth; *That S. Auſtine hereby doth openly shewe, that not onlie an euil Monke ought tolbe remoued from clericall office but a good Mōke is ſcarſelie worthie to be promoted to it.* And a little before theſe words he ſayth *S. Auſtine* ſaw Mōkes who being wearie of their quieteſſe and ſilēce, ād not shewing in their life monaſticall humilitie, impudētly deſired eccleſiaſticall honours, not conſidering (behold this Abbots humilitie, ād the reuerēd conceite he had of the Clergie) what is the differēce betwixt the footeſtole (ſoe he ſtilled his owne Regular ſtate) ād the Chaire, to wit the Clarkes ſtate, wheras in that ſtate a mā ſitteth more ſecurelie, in this more dangerouſly. This humilitie this Abbot learned of *S. Hierome* how in his Epiſtle to Heliodorus ſayth: *Mihi ante presbyterum ſedere non licet, illi, ſi peccauero, licet tradere me Sathanæ in interitum carnis: It is not lawfull for me to ſit before the Prieſt, for him it is lawfull, if I ſinne, to deliuer me vp to Satban, to the deſtruction of the flesh.* This humilitie and reuerent conceite of Prieſts and Bishops if *M. Nicholas* alſo had learned, he would neuer haue endeauoured ſo to detract from the Bis-

hops honour, as we ſee he hath done.

57. Out of this which I haue ſayd of the ſtate and dignitie of Bishops and Inferiour Paſtours (which I hope will not offend, it being all or the moſt parte taken out of Regular Authours) may be gathered in how high and perfect a ſtate or calling, not of perfection to be acquired, but to be exerciſed and communicated to others, the Prieſts of our Seminaries, and Religious houſes are, who are ſent in an Apoſtolicall miſsion into England, to conuert Heretikes, to reclaime Schiſmatiques, to gouerne and comfort Catholiques, to illuminate, perfect, and purge the people by preaching, catechiſing, adminiſtring the Sacraments, and by offering the dreadfull ſacrifice of the maſſe: who are to shewe the people the wayes to good life, vertue, and perfection, not only by wholſome counſailes and exhortations, but alſo by good examples; who are to labour day and night, on horſe backe, on foote, and to expoſe their libertie, yea liues, for the gaining, gouerning, and comforting of ſoules.

58. This office, and calling is the greateſt, as being the calling of the Apoſtles, who were ſent by their maſter Chriſte to trauerſe the world for the gaining of ſoules: this was the calling and office of our Lord and maſter Chriſte Ieſus, who was incarnate and became man

man, liued and conuerſed with vs, preached, wrought miracles, gaue examples of all vertue and perfection, and at laſt ſuffered a cruel death on the infamous Croſſe for the redeeming and gaining of ſoules. This is the greateſt calling ād office in this life. For there is no greater calling, after that of Chriſte, then an Apoſtolicall calling, ſuch as this is: And the reaſon is, becauſe there is no greater perfection then charitie, and there is no greater charitie thē to expoſe ones life for the ſauing of ſoules. *Ioa.* 15.

59. And let not any meruell that I call this an Apoſtolicall calling, becauſe in this, all Paſtours, and eſpecially they who are ſent in miſsion to conuert ſoules, doe ſucceed and imitate the Apoſtles: and as the miſſion of other preachers to other countries, as firſt of *Fugatius* and *Damianus*, then of *S Auſtine* and his companions to our countrie, and of *S. Denys* to France, *S. Palladius* to Scotland, *S. Boniface* to Germanie, is worthily called Apoſtolicall, they all being ſent by the Sea Apoſtolique of Rome, which euer ſent preachers to forraine Countries: ſo they who now are ſent in miſsion to England with intention only to gaine ſoules, are ſent by Apoſtolicall miſsion, becauſe frō the ſame ſea and authoritie. And in this, as our Seminarie Prieſts doe excelle all other Prieſts; ſoe our Religious doe excelle all other Religious

what ſoeuer, who are not ſent in ſuch an Apoſtolicall miſsion, but liue quietlie in their Celles, endeuour their owne ſaluation and perfection, but are, not ſent in miſsion as our English Regulars are to conuerte, and to ſaue the ſoules of others.

60. The queſtion may bee whether as theſe haue the higheſt calling in the Church of God, ſoe they haue alſo a ſtate, And this is not ſoe certaine as that To aſtate of perfectiō (as we haue ſeene) twothings are required. The firſt that it be ordained to acts of perfection: The ſecond that it be immoueable by vowe, oathe, promſſe, pacte, or conuenant. The ſtate of Seminarie Prieſts wanteth not the firſt, as euen now I shewed: only there may ſeeme to be wanting in them an immobilitie which is required to a ſtate as S. *Thomas* hath deliuered, but if that were wanting it would not derogate to the perfectiō of the Seminarie Prieſts office ād calling, becauſe ſtill it shouldbe ordained to the moſt perfect actiōs, ād this is the principall in aſtate of perfection, and by this, oneſtate is iudged to be more perfect or eminent then another.

2. 2. q. 184. a. 4.

61. And yet this immobilitie ſeemeth not altogether wanting: for that the Seminarie Prieſt byndeth himſelfe by oathe to goe to Englād, there toendeauour with hazard of libertie and life, to conuert and gaine ſoules. And indeed Pope Gregorie the thirteenth who

who founded the English Seminarie in Rome hath decreed, that the Schollers who will enioy the benefit of that howſe, shall ſweare (as appeareth by a Bull made for the erecting of that Seminarie) *that they will vndertake an Eccleſiaſticall life, and wilbe ready, omni tempore, at all times, to returne to their Countrie at the Commaundement of the ſuperiour, there to ayde ſoules, as much as in our Lord they can.* And in the oath of that and other Colleges, the Scholler ſweareth vnto Almightie God, that he *Is and wilbe in mynd prepared, as much as his grace ſhall helpe him to receiue orders, and to returne into Englād to gaine ſoules quotieſcumque & quandocumque, ſo often as euer, and when or what tyme ſoeuer, it ſhall ſeeme good in our lord to the ſuperiour of the colledge according to the Inſtitute therof. to commaund him.* And the more yet to bind the Seminarie Prieſt to this ſtate, the holie cōgregation *De Propag. fide*, by commandement from the Pope, hath ordained, that the Schollers of the Popes Semiies shal ſweare, that they willnot enter into Religiō without licence frō the Pope, or not till they haue laboured three yeares in the miſsiō: and if thus they vndertake a Religious life yet by the decree of the ſayed cōgregatiō they muſt goe to labour in the miſsion. *Greg. 13. in bulla edita an. 1579. 9. Kal Maij.*

62. And if by theſe words, *Soe often as euer*, and *When or at what tyme ſoeuer*, it be vnderſtood that although the Prieſt vpon occaſion may retire himſelfe out of England, he will

will yet returne ſoe often as his ſuperiour shall command; then the Seminarie Prieſts ſtate is immoueable, becauſe his oath byndeth him perpetuallie to goe to England when ſoeuer his Superiour shall ſend him: which argueth a perpetuall obligation by oath, which as Nauarre and others doe think byndeth more then a vowe; or if not ſo much as S. *Thomas* thinketh; at leaſt it byndeth ſufficiently to make a ſtate, and more then a pacte or couenaunt, of the Paſtour with his Church; which Suarez (as we haue ſeene) holdeth ſufficient to make an immoueable ſtate. But becauſe I will not take vpon me to interprete ſo rigourouſlie thoſe words *Quotieſcũq; & quandocumque*, but leaue that to Superiours, and to the practiſe of the ſame oath, I will not affirme that the Seminarie Prieſts calling hath a ſufficient immobilitie to make it a ſtate. At leaſt this out of the premiſes is certaine, that the Seminarie Prieſts calling, vnder the Bishop, is the higheſt calling in the Church of God, by reaſon that it is ordained to actes of greateſt perfection, which are to preach, teach, miniſter Sacraments &c. amongeſt heretiques, euen with dayly hazard of his libertie and life.

Nau. c. 27. Man. n. 75. Maior. in 3. d. 39. q. 2. Valentia to 3. diſp. 6. q 7. punct. 4. S. Th. 2. 2. q. 89. a. 8.

63. By this which hath beene ſayed of the ſtate of Bishops, Secular Prieſts, inferiour Paſtours and Seminarie Prieſts, may eaſilie be gathered an Anſwer to all, which M. *Nicholas* allen-

alleageth from the number 14. to the number 16. for the precedence of Regulars in ſtate of perfection. From which number 16. to the number 23. he goeth about to proue, that Religious men are fitter to be ſent in miſsion then ſecular Prieſts are (which is an odious compariſon) wheras notwithſtanding our Sauiour Chriſte, who wanted neither wiſdome nor will, hath made choiſe of Bishops and Prieſts as the Church to this day doth, though Regulars alſo be ſometymes called to be Bishops and Prieſts, and to doe Epiſcopall and Prieſtlie functions. But this, as Suarez ſayth they doe only by delegation and priuiledge, not by ordinarie right and power. And in this ſenſe, it is out of their element: though *M. Nicholas* pag. 232. thinketh this ſtrange: But to this alſo he is anſwered aboue n. 41.42.45. and to his contentment, if reaſon will content him.

To. 3. lib. 1. de Rel. c. 19. n. 14.

M. NICHOLAS.

It remaineth that I explicate a pointe or two handled by M. Doctour obſcurely and with diſaduantage to Religious ſtate. n. 22 in the end. The firſt is, that perfection conſiſteth in charitie, and that the three Euangelicall Counſels, are noe perfection but inſtruments and meanes to perfection etc. n. 23.

M. Doctour ſpeaketh as S. Thomas and Suarez doe.

64. If that ſaying of *M. Doctours* diſpleaſeth *M. Nicholas*, he muſt blame *S. Thomas* and Suarez, yea and all deuines who ſpeake as *M. Doctour* did. And although I haue already cited *S. Thomas* and Suarez, yet to eaſe the Reader of the labour of looking backe, I shal heere againe ſet downe their words. *S. Thomas* alleageth Moyſes Abbot his words to shewe that perfection cõſiſteth in charitie not in the Counſels. The words are theſe: *ieiunia, vigiliæ, meditatio Scripturarum &c. Faſtings watchings, meditation of the Scriptures, nakednes, and priuation of all riches, are not perfection, but inſtruments of perfection, becauſe in them conſiſteth not the end of that diſcipline, but by them is attained the end.* And *S. Thomas* himſelfe in his anſwere to the firſt argument, hath theſe words *Et ideo ex ipſo modo loquendi apparet quod conſilia ſunt quædam inſtrumenta perueniendi ad perfectionem &c. And therefore by the verie manner of ſpeaking it appeareth, that the Counſels are certaine inſtruments to come to perfection.* And Suarez ioyneth with him or rather followeth him in the ſame: *Illa conſilia eorumque obſeruantia non continent formalem perfectionem &c. Thoſe connſels and the obſeruation of them doe not contayne formal perfection, but are inſtruments to acquire it: yet without them perfection may be found.*

S. Th. & Suar infra Caiet. in 2. 2 q. 184. ar. 7

S. Th. 2. 2. q. 184. a. 3. in corp.

Suar. to. 3. l. 1. c. 15. n. 12.

65. But

65. But *M. Nicholas* obiecteth againſt this, that *S. Thomas* in the ſame article ſayth: *Secundario & inſtrumentaliter perfectio conſiſtit in conſilys: Secundarilie and inſtrumentallie perfection conſteth in the Counſels.* I anſwer that to ſaye perfection conſiſteth iuſtrumentallie in the Counſels, is all one as to ſay with *S. Thomas* and Suarez, that they are inſtruments of perfection, but conteyne not formall perfection: otherwiſe *S. Thomas* should contradict himſelfe. Soe the Sacraments doe conteine grace virtuallie and inſtrumentallie, but not formallie, becauſe they are inſtruments by which grace is produced. And therefore Caietan ſayth: *Vbicunque hæc repereris eſſe perfectiones, fatere verum id eſſe, ſed cum grano ſalis, ſcilicet inſtrumentaliter, non eſſentialiter: Wherſoeuer thou findeſt that Counſelles Are perfections, grant it, but With a graine of ſalte, to Wit inſtrumentallie not eſſentiallie.* But *M Nicholas* obiecteth againe, that *S. Thomas* ſayth that *Perfection ſecundarilie and inſtrumentallie*, conſiſteth in the Counſels, which is more then inſtrumentallie, becauſe (ſayth he) *S. Thomas* ſayth alſo, that the perfection of Chriſtian life conſiſteth principallie in the loue of God, ſecondarilie in the Loue of our neighbour, and yet (ſayth *M. Nicholas*) we ſee that *ſecundarilie* and *inſtrumentallie*, are termes much different; for who

2.2.q. 184.a. 3.

Caiet. in 2. 2.q. 184. art. 7.

who will saye that the loue of our neighbour is only an instrument of Christian perfe-ction.

65. I answer that *S. Thomas* in the same article cleareth this difficultie: For he sayth, that *Perfectio dicitur in aliquo consistere dupliciter: vno modo perse & essentialiter: alio modo secundariò & accidentaliter*: *Perfection is sayd to be in one two manner of wayes: one way essentiallie, another way secondarilie and accidentallie.* And so when *S. Thomas* sayth that perfection consisteth *Secundarilie and instrumentallie* in the Counsells, his meaining is; that as the essentiall perfectiō of a man consisteth in his *Essentiall* partes which taken metaphysicallie are *animal* and *Rationale*, physicallie, are the body and the soule, but yet his accidentall perfe-ction which also may be called secondarie, consisteth in the powers, faculties and other perfectiōs of the soule, as science and vertue; so the essentiall perfection of a Christian con-sisteth in charitie; but in the Counsels his perfection consisteth instrumentallie, because they are instruments to get perfection, and meanes also to conserue it; in that they re-moue the occasions of sinne and the impedi-ments of charitie, in which consisteth the es-sentiall perfection: and in these Connsels per-fection also consisteth, yet but secondarilie and accidentallie, as a mans perfection also

secon-

ſecondarilie and accidentallie consiſteth in Science and morall vertues. And this is *S. Thomas* his meaning, when in the firſt article of that queſtion in his anſwer to the ſecond argument he ſayth, that as a liuing creature is ſayd ſimplie and abſolutelie to be perfect, when it hath all the members and diſpoſitiõs required to life, but then is ſayd to be perfect *Secundum quid*, when it hath accidentall perfection: ſo the perfection of a Chriſtian life, ſimplie and abſolutely conſiſteth in charitie, but *Secundum quid* in other vertues which are accidentall perfections. But when *S. Thomas* in the ſame q. and 3. article ſaith that the perfection of Chriſtiã life conſiſteth principallie in the loue of God, *Secondarilie* in the loue of our neighbour, he addeth not *and inſtrumentallie* or accidentallie, as he doth when he ſpeaketh of the Counſelles, but only ſayth, that perfection conſiſteth *Secundariò Secundarilie* in the loue of our neighbour, by which diuerſitie of ſpeech he inſinuateth a differẽce betwixt the Counſelles and the loue of our neighbour; for that in the Counſels perfection ſo conſiſteth Secundarilie, that it conſiſteth alſo in them inſtrumentallie and accidentallie, as I haue explicated: but in the loue of our neighbour, perfection ſo conſiſteth Secondarilie, that it conſiſteth alſo in it eſſen-

2.2.qi 184. art. 1. ad 2.

2.2.q. 184. art. 3.

eſſentiallie not accidentallie or inſtrumentallie, becauſe the loue of our neighbour for God, is a true acte of Charitie, though ſecondarie: and in all actes of charitie eſſentiall perfection conſiſteth, though principallie in the loue of God for himſelfe, which is the firſt and Principall act of Charitie, ſecondarilie in the loue of our neighbour for God, which is the ſecõdarie act of the ſame vertue.

66. And ſo let *M. Nicholas* endeuour all he can, he ſhall neuer be able to proue that perfection conſiſteth formallie in the three Euangelicall Counſelles, which are pouertie chaſtitie and obedience, nor that they of them ſelues are more then inſtrumentes and meanes whereby to attaine to Charitie, which is our perfection: and he ſhall haue S. Thomas, Caietan, Suarez and all Diuines that treate of this matter againſt him.

67. I Deny not but that the actes of the Counſels, as alſo of the precepts, yea and of all vertues if they be done in ſanctifyng grace, and eſpecially if they proceede from charitie doe augment grace and perfectiõ; and in this ſenſe are cauſes of charitie and encreaſe of grace, but then they are not taken by themſelues but with grace and Charitie. And I graunte with Suarez, that although the generall Counſels of pouertie, chaſtitie and obedience be onlie inſtruments of perfection; yet there

Suar. to. 3. l. 1. c. 11. n. 16.

there are particular Counſels, to wit the frequent loue of God, or the intenſe loue of God (which are Counſelled but not commãded) which are formall perfection, becauſe they are formall actes of charitie, in which conſiſteth perfection.

M. Nicholas.

In his 11. chapter n. 12. he writeth thus: There is only this difference betwixt religious and other Chriſtians, that the Religious leaue all things actuallie, other Chriſtians muſt leaue them in prepation of mynde n. 24.

The Reply.

This diſtinction is defended as good.

68. This diſtinction of leauing all actualie or in facte, and in preparation of mynde is vſed by *S. Thomas* and all deuines, who alſo graunte that to leaue all actuallie is proper to religious men; to leaue all in preparation of mynde is common to all Chriſtians, who ought to be ſoe diſpoſed (as they are if they bee in grace and charitie) to leaue all, to wit, goods, libertie, life rather then offend God mortallie. Theſe be *S. Thomas* his words: 2.2. q. 184. art. 7. ad.

Ad

Ad Primum ergo dicendum, quod abrenuntiatio propriarum facultatum dupliciter conſiderari poteſt. Vno modo ſecundum quod eſt in actu. Et ſic in ea non conſiſtit eſſentialiter perfectio, ſed eſt quoddam perfectionis inſtrumentum &c. Alio modo poteſt conſiderari ſecundum præparationem, vt ſcilicet homo ſit paratus (ſi fuerit opus) omnia dimittere vel diſtribuere. Et hæc pertinet directe ad perfectionem. To the firſt therefore it is to be ſayed, that the abrenũciation of our owne goods may be conſidered in two manners. Firſt in acte, and ſo in that (abrenunciation) Perfection conſiſteth not eſſentiallie, but it is a certaine inſtrument of perfection &c. Secondlie it may be conſidered in preparation of mynd, that forſoothe a man be prepared if it ſhalbe needfull to leaue all, or diſtribute all. And this directlie pertaineth to perfection. Where *M. Nicholas* may ſee the diſtinction which he misliked in *M. Doctour*, and howe in actual leauing all, perfection conſiſteth not; but in preparation of mynd, which as *S. Thomas* ſayth *Directlie pertaineth to perfection*. And therefore in the ſame place *S. Thomas* ſayth, that the bishop though he leaueth not all actuallie, is in a greater ſtate of perfection then is the Religious who leaueth all actuallie, becauſe the Bishop *Is moſt of all bound to contemne all for the honour of God and the health of his flocke when it ſhalbe needfull* And this preparation of mynd (as we haue heard *S. Thomas* ſay) *pertaineth directlie to perfection*. But let

let vs heare Caietan, and whether he alſo be not of *S. Thomas* his opinion. Caietan then vpon the alleaged article of *S. Thomas*, hauing, as before I alleaged, affirmed that the Counſelles are but inſtrumentes of perfection, and that actuallie to leaue all riches, or actuallie to leaue a wife, is not perfection, he addeth theſe words, *Isdē autē actus ſecundū animi præparationem ſunt perfectiones longe in altiore gradu quam primo modo quoniam ſunt inſeparabiles Comites ſeu effectus eſſentialis perfectionis, quæ in charitate cōſiſtit: but the ſame actes* (of the Cōnſels) *in preparatiō of mynd, are perfections in a farre higher degree, then in the firſt manner* (that is of actuall leauing) *becauſe they are inſeparable companions or effectes of the eſſentiall perfection which conſiſteth in charitie.* Why then doth *M. Nicholas* ſo ſtorme againſt *M. Doctour* who ſpeaketh, no otherwiſe then *S. Thomas* and Caietan doe? *Caiet. 2. 2. q. 184. a. 7.*

69. But (ſaith *M. Nicolas*) *M. Doctour* in his eleauēth Chapter n. 12 diſtinguisheth the perfection of Charitie neceſſarie to all Chriſtiās by which they are reſolued not to offend God mortally, from another perfection of charitie, by which we ſo loue God as we are readie not only to obſerue the commandements, but alſo the Counſels for his loue and this is the charitie of Religious. It is true *M. Doctour* ſayd ſo in his Hierarchie, and why

should you now ſeeke to draw him into an odious ſenſe, as though he meant now to deny it, and would leaue to Regulars only actuall leauing of things without the loue of God. Religious may and doe no doubt often tymes leaue all actuallie for the loue of God: and the Bishop, as *S. Thomas* ſayth, and all good Chriſtians out of God his loue are prepared only to leaue all: and ſo the difference betwixt Religious and other Chriſtians is, that the Religious leaue all actuallie, other Chriſtians not actuallie, but in preparation of mynd. And the actuall leauing of all is no perfection, but a meanes to get perfection, vnleſſe it be ioyned with the loue of God. And therfore *M. Doctour* ſayth, *that the former* that is the actuall, leauing of all *Is noe perfection but an inſtrument of perfection vnleſſe it be ioyned with the loue of God in which conſiſteth perfection.*

Chap. 1. n. 12.

70. So that *M. Doctour* granteth more perfection to the Religious then he doth to other Chriſtians. For he confeſſeth that they ſo loue God that they not only are willing for the loue of God, to obſerue the commandements as other Chriſtians ought to bee, but alſo the Counſels; and they are not only willing for his loue to leaue all in preparation of mynd as good Chriſtiãs are, but alſo (which is more) for his loue doe actuallie leaue

leaue all. Only this is the difference, that actuall leauing of all may be without the loue of God (for although many noe doubt leaue all for God his loue yet some doe not) but the preparation of mynd to leaue all rather then offend God mortallie, is soe neerly linked to the loue of God that as *Caietan* aboue sayth, it is an inseparable companion or necessarie effect of Charitie. And therfore both *S. Thomas* and he doe affirme (as wee haue seene) that perfection consisteth in that preparation of mynd, but not in actuall leauing of all vnles that actuall leauing proceedeth also from charitie: which is the selfe same that *M. Doctour* sayd, as appeareth by these his words: *the former actuall leauing of them is no perfection, but an instrument of perfectiō, vnles it be ioined vvith the loue of God in vvhich consisteth perfection, as* S. Thomas of Aquin *vvell obserueth.* Yea *M. Nicholas* n. 24. (such is the force of veritie) confesseth that *M. Doctour* saith so. Why then doth *M. Nicholas* taxe *M. Doctour* for distinguishing as he did betwixt actuall leauing all, and leauing all in preparation of mynd, which distinction *S. Thomas*, *Caietan* and all diuines doe admitte? Why doth he in that 24. number seeke to wrest *M. Doctours* words to an odious sense, as though he gaue to religious onlie actuall leauing without the loue of God: but only becausse he was desirous *quærere nodum in scirpo*, to seeke a knotte in a bulrushe, a faulte

Caiet. 22. q. 184. ar. 7.

In his Hier. c. 14. n. 12.

S. Th. 2. 2. qu. 184. ar. 7. ad 1.

where noe fault was, and an vntruth where there was nothing but truth.

71. By this which is ſayed; all that which *M. Nicholas* alleageth from the n. 24. to the n. 29. is eaſilie anſwered: for that all that he ſayth doth onlie prooue theſe points; firſt that actuall leauing all, conduceth to perfection, which is true, becauſe it is a meane and inſtrument: and that it is more, out of the loue of God to leaue all actuallie, then in preparation of mynde, becauſe in actuall leauing is more difficultie; Secondlie that actuall leauing of all when it proceedeth from the loue of God includeth formall perfection, becauſe it includeth charitie: which alſo *M. Doctour* had granted. Thirdly that it is hard to abound in riches and not to be entangled by them with an inordinat loue or
Pſ.61. deſire of them, which is alſo true: though one may flowe in welth and yet not be taking by theſe lime twigges: according to that: *if riches*
Gen.22 *abound ſet not your harte on them*. And therfore *Abraham* in the midſt of his riches, was in mynd prepared not only to haue left them, but alſo to haue killed his one and onlie ſonne, and with his owne hands alſo, at the commandement of God.

M. Nicholas.

In his ninthe Chapter n. 19 M. Doctour vvrites as if he vvere not vnvvilling the Reader should beleeue that the Apoſtles made noe vovve of pouertie, and conſequentlie vvere not religious men, &c.

The Reply.

M. Doctour *only relateth vvhat others ſaye; and indeed it is not ſo certaine, &c. as* M. Nicholas *vvould make it that they vvere religious. But ſuppoſing they vvere religious, yet Chriſte gaue to them povver to preach and miniſter Sacraments not as they vvere religious but as they vvere Biſhops and Prieſts. n. 29.*

72. *M. Doctour* in that place relateth onlie what ſome diuines ſay, but doth not determine that they were not religious: and therfore ſayth, that ſuppoſing they were religious, yet Chriſte gaue not to them as they were religious power to preache & miniſter Sacraments, but only as they were Biſhops & Prieſts, another māner of life pertaining to religious, another to Paſtours: for that they are fedde, theſe feede, they are perfected, theſe perfect, they as regulars are to receiue the Sacraments, theſe are to Miniſter thē, as we haue ſeen aboue, and ſhall ſee more in the next queſtiō. And therfore as *M. Doctour* did not determine this queſtion, whether the Apoſtles were religious or no; ſo neither will I: but if it be

probable that they were religious (as diuers authours hold it) so it shal remaine for mee, who doe not desire to detract from the religious any honour which probablie they may claime. Yet I will relate wat some Authours saye in this matter, that the Reader may see that though it may be probable, yet it is not so certaine as *M. Nicholas* thinketh that they were religious men.

1. p. de Reddi-tibus eccl. c. 1. & 1. p. defens. pag. 887.

„ 73. *Franciscus Sarmiento* a learned Bishop, „ confesseth that the Apostles whilest they were „ disciples obserued pouertie, either by com- „ mandement of Christ for that tyme, or out of „ their free will and deuotion, for that then they „ were in state of proficients and Schollers: and „ therfore Christe for that tyme sayed vnto „ them: *nolite possidere aurum, neque argentum, ne-*

Mat. 10 „ *que pecuniam in zonis vestris: doe not possesse gold,* „ *nor syluer, nor mony in your purses.* But sayth hee „ this was but Counsell, or a temporall precept „ for that tyme. And for that tyme *S. Peter*

Matt. 19. „ sayd: *Ecce nos reliquimus omnia, & sequuti sumus* „ *te: behold vveehaue left all thinges and haue fol.* „ *lovved thee.* But (sayth hee) after they had re- „ ceiued power to absolue from sinnes, and to

Matt. 18. Ioh. 20. „ bynd and loose, and had care & charge of the „ Church and were become to be Masters, and „ in the state of the perfecters of others, then „ pouertie (sayth hee) was not required at their „ hands, yea it was conuenient that they should „ haue goods, therby to helpe the poore, and to

„ giue

„ giue example of charitie: and therfore, ſayth
„ hee pag. 216. Chriſt who exacted pouertie of
„ the young man *Mat.* 19. exacted only of *S. Peter*
„ (when he made him Paſtour) charitie *Ioan.* 21.
„ And although they were not at firſt Bishops
„ and Paſtours, yet becauſe they were shortlie
„ to bee, it was not requiſite (ſaith the ſame Biſ-
„ hop) that whileſt they were diſciples, they
„ should vowe pouertie. And then concludeth
„ thus: *Sub correctione Matris Eccleſiæ exiſtimo nullũ votum expreſsè Apoſtolos emiſiſſe, quia non legitur in Scriptura ſacra, ſequutos tamen conſilia Euangelica, quia perfectiſſimi erant, &c.* Vnder corre-
„ ction of our mother the Church, I think that
„ the Apoſtles made no vowe expreſſelie, be-
„ cauſe it is not reade in the holy ſcripture, yet
„ that they followed the Euangelical Counſai-
„ les, becauſe they were moſt perfect, &c. And
ſo according to the opinion of this learned
Bishop, th' Apoſtles were not religious be-
cauſe they made no vowes.

Sarm. 1. p. defenſionũ pag. 887.

„ 74. *Vaſquez* ſayth, that by the fact of the
„ Apoſtles nothing certaine in this matter can be
„ proued, but only that it was not needfull as
„ wee haue proued, that thy should follow
„ pouertie by vowe, but by Counſell they fol-
„ lowed it whileſt they were vnder the teaching
„ of Chriſte. But although the matter be not cer-
„ tatne, yet (ſayth he without yeelding any rea-
„ ſon) the opinion of *S. Thomas* who ſayth that

In opuſc. §. 1. dub. 2

„ they vowed the thinges that pertaine to per-
„ fection is more probable. But yet that as cer-
„ taine (ſaith he) may hence be gathered, that
„ at leaſt the ſtate of Bishops requireth not ne-
2. Cor. 11. 2. 2. q. 185. art. 6. ad 2. „ ceſſarilie pouertie; yea ſometymes by reaſon
„ of the condition of the tyme, it is more com-
„ modious that they should haue goods, as ſayth
he *S. Auſtine*, *S. Ambroſe*, yea & *S. Paule* (as *S. Thomas* confeſſeth) had. Thus farre *Vaſquez*. So that in his opinion alſo it is not ſo certaine as *M. Nicholas* maketh it, that they vowed pouertie *and the thinges that pertaine to perfection*. And conſequentlie in his opinion, it is not certaine that they were religious, becauſe vowes are neceſſarie to make one religious, yet the ſame Authour (I confeſſe) in another place thinkes that the Apoſtles vowed the counſelles.

Vaſqu. to. 2. in 1. 2. diſput. 164. c. 5

75. And although many in the beginning of the Church preſentlie after the deſcenſion of the holie Ghoſt lued in common, yet as *Eſtius* & *Bartholomæus Petrus Lintrenſis* affirme it is not neceſſarie to ſay that al of them left the proprietie of al they had, it being only a Counſell, and ſome of theſe Chriſtians ſay theſe two Authours had wiues and children, and ſo could not leaue al, but did only contribute to the communitie; & ſo (ſay they) al was common amongſt them all, as all thinges are common amongſt friendes in regard of vſe, but not amongſt all in reſpect of proprietie or dominion. So that all at leaſt of the

Acto. 2. & 4. In illa loca.

the first Christians who are sayd to haue liued in common, were not religious in the opinion of these two learned Doctours.

76. *Baronius* in his Annales sayth, that this communitie of goods amongst the first Christians was not such *as that euerie one that vvould be Christian, could not bee admitted, vnles he first sold all; or that being made Christian, he vvas compelled to this as if to al Christians that rule of life vvas prescribed: for of* Paule *it is knovvē (that he vvarned the Corinthiās by his Epistle, that so they should giue almes to the needy, that their giuing should not be prodigall, least, (sayd he) that vvhich to others is an ease, should be to you a tribulation, but by an equalitie. Let in this present tyme, your aboundance supplie their vvant.* But saith *Baronius*, at the first by a priuate motiō of the holie Ghost these thinges were doone for many causes: as to set an example to posteritie of a stricter life; and therfore (saith *Baronius*) *S. Austine* & *S. Basile* frō this example tooke the forme of their religious life. And this (saith he also) at that tyme when persecutiō was imminēt and was presentlie to follow, was conuenient, least their goods might afterwards be an hindrance vnto thē & cause of falling in persecutiō. *Baron. to. 1 an. Christi 34.* *2. Cor. 8.*

77. *Azorius* relating the manner of life of the first Christians, of which the Actes of the Apostles doe make mention: sayth: *quæ viuendi ratio veluti quidam Cœnobytica vitæ typus & figura fuit: vvhich manner of liuing vvas a certaine type,* *Azor. to. 1. li. 11. mor. Institt. c. 23. Act. 2. & 4.*

and figure of Cœnobyticall (or Monaſticall) life not that he ſayth not that it was a Cœnobytical life, but *a figure of that life*, which afterwards was to be ledde. And (ſayth he) if the heretiques obiect, that in thoſe places (of the Acts) there is noe mention of vowes: *vvee novv doe not endeauour to shevve againſt them that à forme of a religious life in all partes perfect, hath been before*, in Elias, Eliſeus, S. Ihon Baptiſt, *& the firſt Diſciples of the Apoſtles*; *but only for a great part it vvas shadovved & delineated in theſe thinges, vvhich pertaine to meate, drinke, cloath, habitation, and manner of life, pouertie, obedience, chaſtitie.* So that neither doth Azorius hold it as certaine that the Apoſtles or firſt Chriſtians were religious; though before he had cited *S. Thomas* who ſayth *they vovved the thinges that pertaine to perfection*; yea and *S. Auſtine* who ſayth that the Apoſtles vowed pouertie. To which place *Franciſcus Sarmiento* anſwereth, that *S. Auſtine* by vowe in that place vnderſtandeth a full purpoſe of keeping pouertie, which purpoſe ſayth hee, the Apoſtles left, when they were noe more diſciples but Maiſters and Paſtours.

S. Th. 2. 2 q. 88. ar. 8. ad 3.

Aug. li. 17. de Ciuit. Dei c. 4.

Sarm ſupra p. 1. defeſ. pag. 887.

78. *Caietane* a Regular, principal Thomiſt, and Cardinall, in his commentarie vpon the 19. Chapter of *S. Matthevv*, explicating theſe words: *Vade & vende omnia, &c. & veni ſequere me*: goe & ſell all, &c. and come and followme: Hath theſe words. *Attende lector, quod nullum indicitur à* IESV *votum, volenti perfectionem vitæ aſſequi:*

qui: quia non in vinculis votorum, sed in operibus consistit perfectionis assecutio. Laudabilia sunt vota Religionis, sed non in illorum professione sed operibus quibus imitamur IESVM CHRISTVM, *acquiritur perfectio. Infinitus est hodie numerus eorum qui acquirunt perfectionis statum profitendo religionis vota: sed rari sunt qui volunt esse perfecti, imitando* IESVM *factis humilitatis, patientiæ, mansuetudinis, charitatis, &c.* Marke *Reader that noe vovve is denounced* (or commaunded) *from* IESVS-CHRISTE *to him that vvill attaine to perfection of life: becauſe the attaining of perfection conſiſteth not in the bonds of vovves, but in vvorkes by vvhich vvee imitate* IESVS CHRISTE. *Laudable the vovves of Religion, yet not in their profeſsion but in vvorkes by vvhich vve imitate* IESVS CHRIST *perfection is gotten. There is at this day an infinite number of thoſe vvho get a ſtate of perfection, by profeſsing the vovves of Religion: but rare they are vvho vvilbe perfect, by imitatim* IESVS *in vvorkes of humilitie, patience, mildenes, charitie, &c.* So that *Caietan* is of opinion, that in theplace of Scripture alleaged there is noe mention of vowes, and yet they who hold that the Apoſtles were religious, out of this place eſpeciallie proue the three vowes of Religion. And ſeing that without vowes a man cannot be religious: if out of this place it can not (as *Caietan* thinketh) be proued that the Apoſtles vowed, it can not out of this place be proued, that the Apoſtles were religious, vowes being neceſſarie to make a man religious.

Suarez to. 3. de Relig. l. 2. c. 15. n. 13. 14 15. 16. Vasqu. to. 2. in 1. 2. disp. 164. c. 4. & 5.

79. But ſuppoſe the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians vowed, yet doth it not follow that they were religious: for that as *Suarez* and *Vaſquez* doe confeſſe, the three vowes are not ſufficient to make one a religious man. But the order and Inſtitute muſt be approued ether by the Bishop in his Dioceſe, as ancientlie it was, or by the Pope as afterwards was decreed. And the religious his vowe muſt be accepted of the Superiour who hath Iuriſdiction ouer him, and authoritie to receiue his vowes. And what certaintie is there that the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians liued in an order approued by Chriſte or *S. Peter*, or that their vowes were accepted by Chriſte or *S. Peter* as ſufficient to make them religious, ſeing that holy Scripture ſayth nothing of any ſuch acceptation?

Suarez to. 3 l. 3 de auctore & orig. & antiq. ſtatus relig. c. 2. n. 9.

Nu. 10.

8. I confeſſe that the learned *Suarez* defendeth that the Apoſtles vowed pouertie, chaſtitie, & obedience, and were religious, & that Chriſt not only inſtituted a religious ſtate in generall in regard of the three Counſelles, but alſo made a religion in particular to which he called the Apoſtles *eis proprium & particularem modum vitæ religioſæ tribuendo*, *giuing to them a proper and particular manner of liuing*. And this particulet manner of liuing he ſaith conſiſted in a life mixte partly contemplatiue partlie actiue in endeauouring the conuerſion of ſoules. But yet his proofes out of Scripture doe only proue that Chriſte inſtituted the Counſels and commended

ded

ded them: what he alleageth out of ſome Authours prooueth only that the Apoſtles vowed the Counſels, which yet is not ſufficient to make them religious as we haue ſeene: what he bringeth out of other Authours only proueth that the Apoſtles gaue examples of religious life by liuing at firſt in common, and by obſeruing pouertie, chaſtitie and obedience, but not that they were religious, though I deny not but that ſome Authours doe affirme, that the Apoſtles were religious, which yet might be vnderſtood, not that they were properlie and compleatelie religious, but only for that they obſerued or vowed the three Euangelicall Counſels.

81. Wherefore *Vaſquez* reſolueth the matter thus: *His præmiſſis, quod attinet ad ſtatum religionis diſtinguendum eſt, &c.* *These thinges premiſed, vvee muſt diſtinguish concerning the ſtate of Religion. For ether to haue inſtituted the ſtate of religiō is all one as to haue inuented & excogitated it, and to haue propoſed it to others to be followed: and in this ſenſe vve muſt ſay that the ſtate of religion vvas inſtituted by Chriſte our Lord, that is propoſed and preached, as is gathered by the thinges vvee haue ſaid: or to inſtitute a ſtate of religion, is all one as indeed to erect it vnder the povver and Juriſdiction of one Heade: and ſo it is not to bee ſayd that the inſtitution of this ſtate is of the deuine or naturall lavve. For ſeing that to conſtitute a ſtate of religion it is neceſſarilie required that he vvho vovveth, ſhould make the* To. 2. in 1. 2, diſp. 4. & 5.

three

three vowes vnder the Iuriſdiction of a Superiour (præpoſiti) as aboue is explicated, and ſeing that it is in the vvill of the legiſlatour to accept of the three vowes of him that vowveth them, that ſo he may haue him for his ſubiect; it followveth that the erection of a religious ſtate doth pertaine to the poſitiue lavve, or to the vvill of the humane legiſlatour; for that the three vowes made, haue not this by the lavve of nature or by the diuine lavve, to conſtitute him that vowveth vnder the Iuriſdiction peculiarlie required to religion, of an head or ſuperiour: but this agreeth to them by the conſtitution of the Church or Cheefe Bishop. Thus he. And ſeing it can not be shewed out of Scripture or coũcells, or anciẽt Auctours, that the Apoſtles made their vowes of the three counſelles vnder the iuriſdiction of an Heade, who accepted their vowes, it can not ſo clearely be showed that they were properly & cõpleatelie religious, though they had vowed the three Counſelles which are the ſubſtance of all religious. It is true that Chriſte was head to the Apoſtles and Diſ-
Ioã.21. ciples, and ſo vnder Chriſte was *S. Peter*, as now the Pope his ſucceſſour is, to all Chriſtians. But that the Apoſtles or Diſciples liued vnder Chriſte firſt, and after vnder *S. Peter* as religious vnder an Abbot, cannot ſoe eaſilie be proued.

82. This I haue ſayd only to shewe that it is not ſo certaine as *M. Nicholas* ſeemeth to make it, that the Apoſtles were religious men: but not

in

in any case to take from the Regulars any honour to which they may make any probable claime; and therfore I leaue this opinion which some hold of the Apostles being religious, in all the probabilitie it might haue, not intending to derogate to it : and this which I haue sayd, I would not haue sayd, had not *M. Nicholas* egged and prouoked mee in his 4. qu. n. 29.



THE

THE SIXT QVESTION.

Whether Religious as religious bee of the Hierarchie.

M. NICHOLAS.

M. Doctour *after his wonted manner is heere reduplicating Religious as religious but neuer ſecular as ſecular.*

THE REPLY.

Reduplication is defended, and by it, Regulars are excluded from the Hierarchie.

1. REduplication (as M. *Nicholas* should knowe) is frequentlie vſed in the Schooles, not onlie of Philoſophe but

but alſo of diuinitie, and it ſerueth much to know, and to diſtinguiſhe the natures of thinges. And to omit examples hereof, which might be brought out of Philoſophie, as *album currit* but not as *album*; *muſicus ædificat*, but not as *muſicus*: In diuinitie wee ſaye, that God dyed, not as God, but as man; the man Chriſte created the world, not as man, but as God: the B. Virgin is mother of God, not as God, but as man: the ſonne of God was borne of the Virgin MARIE, not as God, but as man, for as God he was borne only of his eternall father. And ſo regular Bishops or Prieſts, are of the Hierarchie as much as other Bishops and Prieſts, yet not as regulars, but as Bishops or Prieſts.

2. Wheras *M. Nicholas* excepteth againſt *M. Doctour* for ſaying that Regulars as Regulars are not of the Hierarchie, and yet ſaith not, that ſecular Prieſts as ſecular are not of the Hierarchie: I anſwer, that *M. Doctour* wanted not his reaſon.

3. For wee may compare ſecular Prieſts with regulars diuerſelie. Firſt, as both are only Chriſtians, and ſo both are members of the Church, neither of the Hierarchie, as it is taken for that part of the Church which ruleth perfecteth and illuminateth, as wee ſhall ſhew by and by. Secondly wee may compare ſtate with ſtate, to witt, the ſtate of a ſecular Prieſt with the

ſtate

ſtate of the Regular. And then I ſaye that a ſecular Prieſt as a ſecular Prieſt, that is conſidered as in that ſtate, is of the Hierarchie as it conſiſteth of diuers orders, by reaſon of his order and caracter. And becauſe this caracter maketh him apt for Iuriſdiction, he is apt alſo to be of the Hierarchie as it importeth degree in Iuriſdiction. But the regular as regular, that is, taken Preciſelie in the ſtate of a regular, is not of the Hierarchie, becauſe, as a regular, he hath neither order nor Iuriſdiction. And ſo the ſecular Prieſt by vertue of his ſtate of Prieſthood, is of the Hierarchie, the regular by vertue of his ſtate of regular is not of the Hierarchie, though if he be Bishop, Prieſt or Deacons, &c. He be alſo of the Hierarchie as much as the ſecular Bishop or Prieſt. But as regular he is not of the Hierarchie. And if as regular he were of the Hierarchie, then all regulars euen lay brothers and religious women should be of the Hierarchie.

4. For as becauſe it agreeth to man as man to be riſibilis, it agreeth to euerie man to be riſibilis, ſo if it agree to a regular as regular to bee of the Hierarchie, euerie regular though but a Conuerſe or a lay brother or Siſter, muſt be of the Hierarchie.

5. Wherfore *Dionyſius Carthuſianus* vſeth *M. Doctours* reduplication. For he explicating *S. Dionyſius Areopagita* ſayth, that *S. Denys; declarat, id eſt, ſignificat monachorum ordinem non eſſe prala-*

Dionyſ. Carthe. art. 13. in Theriã c. 6

tum

cum alijs iuriſdictionaliter atque Prælatice, in quantum ſunt monachi; *doth declare, that is, ſignifie that the order of monkes as they are monkes (behold hir reduplication) is not placed ouer others Iuriſdictionallie and in maner of Prelates:* Though the ſame authour preſentlie after granteth that monkes in their owne orders haue Prelacie ouer others as Abbots and Priours haue, and that in later tymes religious men were more frequentlie admitted to be Prieſts, which *M. Doctour* alſo granteth.

6. Wherfore *M. Nicholas* muſt not except againſt that reduplication of Regulars as Regulars, leaſt he except againſt the miſſion of Regulars into England; for although their obſeruing of their vowes and rules doth much perfect them if they obſerue them as they should doe, yet as Regulars they can doe litle good in England in this tyme of perſecution; for that they can not keepe the Quire and Cloiſter, they cannot riſe at midnyght to ſing Matins, they cannot weare their habit, nor vſe abſtinence or other auſteritie, externallie, therby to giue good example (for that by reaſon of perſecution they fare as others, are lodged and cloathed & haue almoſt in all thinges the ſame libertie that others haue) and ſo as Prieſts they are ſent to England, and as Prieſts by Preaching and Miniſtring Sacraments they are moſt beneficall to our Countrie,

2.2.q. 184 a.8 in corp.

7. And that Prieſts not Curats or Paſtours are in a perfecter ſtate then Regulars as Regulars not Prieſts, S. Thomas planelie teacheth who comparing Religious with ſecular Prieſts who are Curats or Archdeacons, ſayth only that a Religious man as Religious excelleth the ſecular Prieſt not as Prieſt but as in ſtate of ſecular: and no meruayle, for ſo the Prieſt is conſidered as he aggreeth with lay men: and therfore a litle after in the ſame place, he ſayth: *Si vero Religioſus etiam ordine careat (ſicut patet de conuerſis religionum) ſic manifeſtum eſt excellere praeeminentiam ordinis quantum ad dignitatem, &c. But if the Religious vvanteth alſo order (as conuerſes doe) ſo it is manifeſt that the preeminence of order doth excell in dignitie: becauſe by holy order one is deputed to moſt vvorthie miniſteries by vvhich ſernice is done to Chriſt him ſelfe in the Sacrament of the Altar, to vvhich is required greater interiour ſanctitie, then the ſtate of Religion requireth becauſe as Dionyſius ſayth in his ſixt chapter of the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie, the Monaſticall order ought to followv Prieſtlie orders, and by their imitation to aſcend to diuine thinges.* Thus S. Thomas. And who doubteth but that the holy order of Prieſthood eſpeciallie, excelleth the regular ſtate which is no holy order: and conſequētly who can doubt but that a Prieſt as Prieſt is in an higher ſtate then

then a Regular as Regular? Valentia a Ieſuite ſpeaking of inferiour Prelates ſayth: *Si in eiuſmodi Prælatis, &c. If in ſuch Prelates vvee conſider the degree of the holy order, ſpeaking ſimply, ther is ſome thing in them vvorthier and more perfect, then in the religious as religious, not in holy orders.* VVhere we ſee he vſeth *M. Doctours* reduplication which offendeth *M. Nicholas*, and preferreth the holy order before the ſtate and perfection of a religious man who is not in holy orders:

Val. to. 3. diſp. 10 q. 2. punct. 5. conc. 2.

M. Nicholas.

I grante that if vve limit the name of Hierarchie to Bishops, Prieſts, Deacons, &c. then to ſay that Religious not Prieſts or Bishops are not of the Hierarchie, is no more then to ſay, religious not Prieſts or Bishops are no Prieſts or Bishops, vvhich ſurelie is no greate myſterie, but then it should be prooued vvith vvhat ground the name of Hierarchie should be ſoe limited. n. 2.

The Reply.

Hovv regulars are of the Hierarchie, and hovv they are not.

8. M. *Nicholas* from this place beginneth to proue, that Regulars are of the Hierarchie. And trulie if ether God or his Church had beſtowed that honour on them, God forbid that I should goe about to take it from them. rather I would by word and writing defend it and hazard euen my life to aſſure it the more vnto them. But if neither God nor his Church hath giuen them this honour, neither muſt we giue it to them leaſt wee breake God his ordinaunce, neither should they deſire it. But as the laytie

mur-

murmureth not againſt the Clergie (as *Core*, *Dathan* and *Abiron*, and their followers did againſt *Moyſes* and *Aaron*) for that they may not preache nor miniſter Sacraments: and as thoſe of the ſecular Clergie ought not to take it in euil part, that they are not eſteemed religious: Soe neither ſhould the religious be offended, if wee ſay that they are not of the Hierarchie, neither God nor his Church hauing beſtowed that honour vpon them, though they be adorned with many other graces. Rather they may reioice in God, that they haue many perfections of a religious life, which others haue not, and are furniſhed with moe meanes to attaine to perfection then ſecular Prieſts haue, and that their ſtate is more ſecure and free from danger then any other ſtate is. *Num.* 16.

9. And if *M. Nicholas* who endeauoureth to proue them to be of the Hierarchie meane only, that they are members of the Church which is a Hierarchie; neither *M. Doctour* nor any good Catholique will or can deny it: Nay *M. Doctour* in his Hierarchie, ſayth: *that religious men as religious, are a greate ornament to the Church and are in this ſenſe of the Hierarchie of the Church, in that they are eminent members of the Church and are ordained to help and aſſiſt Biſhops and Paſtours, &c.* *Chap.* 8. *n.* 7.

10. But if he meane that they are of the Hierarchie as commonly it is taken by S. Denys and diuines, for that part of the Church which gouerneth, illuminateth, perfecteth, and purgeth the reſt by preaching, and adminiſtration of Sacraments, &c. ſo only Biſhops, Paſtours, Prieſts, and other Miniſters are of the Hierarchie. And in this ſenſe the holie Councell of Trent taketh the Hierarchie ſaying: *Si quis dixerit in Eccleſia Catholica non eſſe Hierarchiam diuina ordinatione inſtitutam, qua conſtat ex Epiſcopis & Presbyteris & Miniſtris: Anathema ſit: If any ſhall ſaye that there is not in the Church a Hierarchie inſtituted by the diuine ordinance, which conſiſteth of Biſhops and Prieſts and Miniſters: let him be accurſed.* Sess. 23 can. 6. VVhere we ſee that the Hierarchie is taken only for that part of the Church which conſiſteth of Biſhops, Prieſts, and Miniſters, and ſeing that Regulars as Regulars are neither Biſhops, Prieſts, nor Miniſters in the Church, as Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons are, they are not, as Regulars of the Hierarchie in this ſenſe: for if as Regulars they were of the Hierarchie in this ſenſe, then lay brothers and ſiſters who are trulie Regulars ſhould be of the Hierarchie in the ſame ſenſe, and ſo ſhould be comprehended vnder Biſhops, or Prieſts, or Miniſters in the Church.

11. And

11. And therfore I wonder that *M. Nicholas* pag. 165. should saye, *that it is temeritie to affirme that the Councell intended to define as a matter of faythe, that vnder the name of Hierarchie could be comprehended only Bishops, Priests, or other Ministers indued vvith order or iurisdiction:* rather it may seeme greate temeritie in *M. Nicholas* to comprehend Regulars as Regulars vnder that definition, they as such being neither Bishops, nor Priests, nor Ministers in the Church. But peraduenture *M. Nicholas* will comprehend Regulars vnder th word *Ministers*. And why so? are they as Regulars Ministers in the Church, who as Regulars can not by office preach or Minister Sacraments, or assist at the Altar with the Deacon and Subdeacon? did he euer reade or heare that Regulars were called Ministers of the Church? Certes *Vasquez* a Iesuite and Regular, vnder that word *Ministris*, *Ministers*, comprehendeth only Deacons, not other inferiour Ministers, much lesse vnder that word would he vnderstand Regulars who as Regulars were neuer called Ministers in the Church, they as Regulars hauing no Church-functions. Others vnder that word *Ministers*, vnderstand Deacons and Subdeacons: but none vnderstand Regulars.

Vasq. to. 3. disp. 238. c. 2.

22. *M. Doctour* in his Hierarchie, chap. 15. touched this queſtion, whether regulars be of the Hierarchie in the former ſenſe; and indeed he ſeemed only to touche it, and that with greate moderation and reſpect to Religious, and therfore alleaged noe Authours for the proofe of it: And I alſo becauſe I would not giue the leaſt occaſiō of offece, would haue beene ſparing in this matter, but that *M. Nicholas* vrgeth me much in his 6. queſtion where he handleth this point at large, and ſayth n. 1. that *nothing is more frequent, then that ſome perſons* (hee ſeemeth to meane *M. Doctour* for one) *vvho I dare ſay ſcarſelie euer read* S. Denys *nor euer vvere much conuerſant in* S. Thomas of Aquin (*from vvhom vve haue the beſt and almoſt only Treatiſes of the Hierarchie, vvilbe diſcourſing of the ſecular Clergie, as though they only vvere of the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie*. And becauſe *M. Nicholas* will ſeeme to be more conuerſant in *S. Denys* and *S. Thomas* then others are, and ſayth that *from them vve haue the beſt and almoſt only Treatiſes of the Hierarchie:* I ſhall eſpeciallie examine what *S. Denys* ſayth of the Hierarchie, and I will shewe foe plainelie and clearlie out of him (from whence indeed *S. Thomas* and all deuines, haue learned that which they ſay of the Hierarchie) that regulars in his opinion and as he taketh

the

the word Hierarchie are not of the Hierarchie, that the Reader will confeſſe, that either *M. Nicholas* neuer read *S. Denys* (and ſo is of the number of them who as he ſayth *ſcarſelie euer read S. Denys*, or if he read him, that he vnderſtood him not, or wittinglie and willinglie diſſembled his opinion.

13. *S. Denys* then in his booke of the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie ſpeaking of thoſe who are of the Hierarchie reckeneth only the Biſhop, Prieſt, and Deacons: and ſayth that the Biſhops office is to perfect, the Prieſts to illuminate, the Deacons to purge. And in the ſayd Chapter in his contemplation he telleth how they all three are ordained. And the Biſhop he ſayth is the firſt and Chiefe order, in whom the reſt are conſummated. For, ſayth he, as the whole Hierarchie of the Church is conſummated in the Chiefe Hierarch and Biſhop, Chriſte, ſoe euerie ſpirituall and particular Hierarchie, that is euerie particular Church is terminated and conſummated in its proper Biſhop. Which may be noted againſt *M. Nicholas* who would haue a particular Church without a particular Biſhop. So that *S. Denys* in the Hierarchie placeth only Biſhops, Prieſts & Deacons, to whom are reduced Subdeacons and other inferiour orders, if eſpeciallie theſe be of the deuine inſtitution:

L. de Eccl. Hierarch. cap. 5.

of which point *M. Doctour* hath disputed in his Hierarchie.

Dion. l. Eccl. Hier. c. 6.

14 In the next chapter which is the sixt he treateth of the three orders of those that are perfected. And Dionysius Carthusianus in his *Elucidation* or explication of this sixt chapter, sayth that S. Denys in the former chapter treated of the three orders of perfectors, that is, the Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, but now in the sixt hapter he speaketh of three orders of those that are perfected. And he obserueth that when S. Denys speaketh of the three orders of those that perfect others, the name *order* signifieth a name of dignitie; but when he speaketh of the three orders of them that are perfected: the name *order* signifieth no name of dignitie, but rather is a name of subiection.

15. S. *Denys* in that sixt chapter sayth that the orders of those who are perfected are in generall three. The last, as Dionysius Carthusianus explicateth, to wit, they that are purged are 5. that is, Catechumenes, Energumenes, Apostataes, vicious, infirme and timide or fearfull persons: the next aboue them are the people baptized and admitted to the sacred Eucharistie: the highest order of those that are perfected, are the Monkes and religious who therfore are called according to the Translation of Lanselius:

lius : *Summum eorum qui initiantur & perficiuntur ordo : The cheefe order of those that are initiated and perfected* : not the cheefe in the Church, because S. Denys placeth Bishops, Priests, and Deacons before them, but the first of those who are initiated and perfected. Dion. Cart. sayth that the order of Mõkes is *perfectus inter perficiendos : perfect amongest those that are to be perfected ; but not amongest those that perfect others.* Art. 13 super Tho. 6

16. All this may be confirmed by what S. *Denys* sayth in his Epistle to *Demophilus* Monke, where checking him for hauing Kicked a penitent who was confessing to the Priest, and for contemptuous lie vsing the Priest him selfe, he taketh him vp in these words : *Nefas est sacerdotem a Ministris qui te superiores sunt, aut à tui ordinis Monachis corrigi & reprehendi, &c. It is not lawfull that a Priest should be corrected or reprehended by the Ministers who are aboue thee, or of the Monkes of thy order, &c.* and he giueth the reason, saying : *Sacerdotes autem nuncij atque interpretes (secundum pontifices) sunt diuinorum iudiciorum : ab eis recte & ordine, tu per medios interiectosque Ministros, cum tempus postulabit, diuina disce, à quibus etiam vt monachus esses habuisti. An non hoc etiam clamant sacra mysteria ? neque enim planè omnibus aditus ad Sancta Sanctorum interdictus est, sed proximè*

ad ea

ad ea accedit Pontificum ordo, deinde Sacerdotum, tum ſecundum hos, miniſtrorum. Ijs autem qui Monachi inſtituti ſunt, valua adytorum occluſa ſunt, ad quas & initiantur & aſſiſtunt, non vt eas Cuſtodiant ſed vt agnoſcant & ſe & ordinem ſuum; propiusq; ad populum quam Eccleſiaſtici ordinis homines accedunt, &c. Prieſts next to the Bishops are the meſſengers, or relaters and interpretors of the diuine iudgements: of them by meanes of the middle Miniſters, rightlie and by order vvhen the tyme shall require, doe thou learne the diuine thinges, of vvhom alſo thou hadſt that thou vvaſt monke. Do not the ſacred myſteries crye this? For that to all is not interdicted acceſſe to the Holies of Holies; but next to them hath acceſſe the order of Bishops, then of Prieſts, then, after them, of the miniſters. But to them vvho are inſtituted monkes, the doores of the Chaunſelles or ſecret places of the Temple are shut at vvhich they are initiated, and doe aſſiſt not to keepe them, but that they may acknovvledge themſelues and their order, and they doe approche neerer to the people then the men of the Eccleſiaſticall order doe. By which it appeareth, that according to *S. Denis* Regulars in his tyme wen excluded from the presbyterie and the Chaunſell, and only were admitted to the doores, but were not admitted into that holy and ſecret place.

17. But

17. But let vs heare a worthie Regular ſpeake. Father *Ihon de S. François* Generall in his tyme of the order of *S. Bernard* called the order of the *Fueillianes* in Paris vvho is famous for his Tranſlation of *S. Denis* his worke into french. Hee (in his Apollogie for theſe workes in anſwering an obiection made by Scaliger againſt them) hath theſe words. *Pour l'intelligence de ce que nous diſons, faut ſuppoſer que ſainct Denis, voulant monſtrer le bel ordre qui eſt en la Hierarchie de l'Egliſe, diuiſe tout le peuple Chreſtien en deux parties, dont l'vne eſt celle du Clergé, l'autre eſt du peuple laïque. Il diſtingue tout le Clergé en trois ordres: le premier eſt celuy des Eueſques, l'autre des Preſtres, & le tiers de liturges, &c.* For the vnderſtanding of this vvhich vve ſay, *it muſt be ſuppoſed that* S. Denys *intending to shevv the goodlie order vvhich is in the Hierarchie of the Church, deuideth all the Chriſtian people into tvvo parts; of vvhich the one is that of the Clergie, the other of the lay people. He diſtinguisheth all the Clergie into three orders: The firſt is that of the Bishops, the other of Prieſts, and the third of the liturges,* that is Deacons, to whom the other Miniſters of the Church are reduced. *He diſtribueth the people in like manner into three Quires: the firſt is that of Catechumenes, Energumenes and Penitents: the ſecond parte is that vvhich is the holy people, and the third is of the Monkes. And becauſe that all the miniſterie of the Hierarchie conſiſteth in three thinges, either in purging or illu-* Chap. 13. pag. 74.

illuminating or perfecting, or in being purged, illuminated, or perfected. Therfore he (S. Denys) calleth the order of liturges (Deacons) καθαρτικὴν τάξιν, purgatiue order; that of Priests φωτιστικὴν, *illuminatiue*, and that of the Bishops τελεστικὴν *perfectiue or perfecting. Respectiuelie he (S. Denys) calleth the Catechumenes, Energumens, and Penitents, τάξιν βαιρομενὴν, the order that is purged*; the solie people θεωρητικὴν, or φωτιζομενὴν, illuminated, and the order of Monkes τετελεσμενὴν. perfected.

18. And a litle after this Auctour addeth: *Voylà donc premierement comme il constitue les Moynes entre le peuple laique qui estoient ceux qui faisoyent profession d'vne plus grande perfection que les autres, & d'vne vie plus denote & spirituelle, renonçans aux affections & soucis des choses de ce monde, se denouans & consacrans totalement au seruice de Dieu, &c.* Behold then first of all how he (S. Denys) placeth the Monkes amongest the lay people, which Monkes, were they who made profession of a greater perfection then others, and of a life more denoute and spirituall, renouncing the affections and cares of the thinges of this world, vowing and cõsecrating them selues wholie to the seruice of God, &c And after that, to wit in the page 76. and 77. he relateth out of S. Denys how the Priests that vvere vnder the Bishop had the office to cõsecrate

L. de Hier. Eccl. c. 6.

secrate the Monkes vvho made (sayth he) their profession *entre les mains des Prestres au dessoubs des Euesques: betvvixt the handes of the Priests vnder the Bishop.* And pag. 78. this Auctour shevveth out of S. Denys in his Epistle to *Demophilus* hovv the ranke and place of the Monkes in publicque assemblies vvas vvith the lay people, though as vve haue seene they vvere aboue the people and vnder the Clergie: and sayth this Auctour: *Leur estoit deffendu d'entrer dans le Presbytere: It vvas forbidden them to enter into the Presbyterie.* All vvhich and more S. Denys him selfe hath in his fift and sixt chapter, of his Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie as may partlie appeare by that vvhich I haue alleaged out of those tvvo chapters.

19. By this it is manifest that according to S. Denys, and as he vnderstandeth the vvord *Hierarchie*, the Regulars are not of the Hierarchie, that is of that parte of the Church, vvhich gouerneth the rest, and ministreth Sacraments and preacheth, and therby purgeth, illuminateth and perfecteth, vvhich (as S. Denys sayth) are the proper actions of the Hierarchie, and are called Hierarchicall actiõs, vvhich also are exercised in the Hierarchie of the Angels in vvhich the Superiour orders illuminate, purge, and perfecte the inferiour. And therfore

fore in *S. Denis* his tyme regulars tooke their place beneath the Clergie and aboue the lay people. And although in later tymes the Regulars enioyed the Clericall priuiledge, and were more frequentlie ordained Subdiacons, Deacons, Priests, yea and Bishops, and as such are of the Hierarchie: yet as Regulars they are not of the Hierarchie in *S. Denys* his opinion; for then in his tyme also they should haue bene of the Hierarchie. And *M. Nicholas* who told vs that *many vvho neuer read* S. Denys *are forvvard to discourse of the Clergie as though they only vvere of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie*, Sheweth that he either neuer read, or vnderstood not *S. Denys*, who will haue regulars to be of the Hierarchie, and euen according to *S. Denys* his opinion.

20. And thus I hope I haue brought sufficient proofe out of *S. Denys* to exclude regulars as regulars from the gouerning and perfecting Hierarchie, though I grante them to be eminent members of the Church which is a Hierarchie, to wit, in like manner as they are members and subiectes of the Kingdome, who though eminent, beare no rule in it. And seing that (as *M. Nicholas* confesseth) what other Doctours, euen *S. Thomas of Aquin*, say of the Hierarchie they take out of *S. Denys*, his Authoritie is to be preferred before them all.

21. Se-

21. Secondlie I adde to S. Denis and his Translatours and Expositours a reason or two. And my first shalbe taken out of the Councell of Trent alleaged in my Reply to this question n. 7. The Councell defineth, that there is a Hierarchie in the Church *vvhich consisteth of Bishops, Priests, and Ministers.* But Regulars as Regulars are neither Bishops, Priests, nor Ministers; *ergo* they are not of the Hierarchie, as the Councell of Trent taketh the word Hierarchie. The minor proposition I haue proued in that number; and so the conclusion must follow. *Sess. 23 can. 6.*

22. My second reason vvhich excludeth them from the Hierarchie in the meaning of S. Denis, shalbe this: They who are of the Hierarchie must simpathise with that part which is cõfessedlie of it, to wit, with Bishops, Priests, and Ministers, in their manner of life and profession, in their actions and functions: but Regulars as Regulars doe leade a life altogether different frõ the life of Bishops, Priests and Ministers of the Church, and their actions and functions are as different: *ergo* Regulars as Regulars are not of the Hierarchie. The maior or first proposition is euident, for that all who are of the same arte or trade, of the same science or profession doe agree in actions, functions and manner of life; and therfore lawiers agree in pleading and giuing Counsel, Phy-

sitians are busied in prescribing and ministring Physicke, Carpenters vvorke in timber; masons in stone, &c.

23. The minor and second proposition, to wit, that Regulars as Regulars doe differ in actions, functiõs, and manuer of life I shall proue out of S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostome, and other Authours of good authoritie: and so the conclusion must follow. S. Ambrose in an Epistle to them of Vercelles, cõparing the state of the Clergie with that of the Regulars sayth: *Namq; hæc duo in attentiore Christianorum deuotione præstantiora esse quis ambigat, Clericorum officia & Monachorum instituta? Ista ad comitatem & moralitatem disciplina, illa ad abstinentiam assuefacta atq; patientiam. Hæc velut in quodam Theatro, ista in secreto: spectatur ista illa absconditur: Who can doubt but that these two, the offices of Clarkes, and the institutes of Monkes, are the more excelling in the more attent deuotion of Christians. This discipline* (of Clarkes) *accustomed to humanitie and moralitie, that* (of Regulars) *to abstinence and patience. This* (the state of Clarkes) *is as in a Theater, that in secret; this is obnious to the eyes of men, that is hidden.* And a litle after: *This life therfore* (of the Clergie) *is in a race, that in a denne. This against the confusion of the vvorld, that against the desire of the flesh; this subduing, that flying the pleasures of the body. This more grate full, that more se-*

Amb. l. 9. Ep. 82.

cure.

enre. This gouerning it ſelfe, that restraining it ſelfe, yet both denying them ſelues that they may be of Chriſte, becauſe to the perfect it is ſayd, he that vvill come after mee, let him deny him ſelfe to him ſelfe, and take his croſſe and followv mee. And againe: *Hac ergo dimicat, illa ſe remouet, hac illecebras vincit, illa refugit, huic mundus triumphatur, illi ignoratur: huic plura tentamenta, & ideo maior victoria: illi infrequentior lapſus, & facilior cuſtodia:* This life therfore (of Priests) fighteth, that (of Regulars) vvith dravveth it ſelfe from fight: this ouercommeth allurements, that flyeth them: to this life the vvorld is triumphed ouer, to that it is banished: To this life are incident more tentations, and therfore greater victorie; To that life (of Regulars) ſeeldomer falling, more eaſie cuſtodie.

24 S. Hierō declareth this differēce of liues thus: *Alia eſt Monachi cauſa, alia Clericorum: Clerici paſcunt oues, ego paſcor:* Other is the cauſe of a Monke, other of Clarkes; Clarkes feed the sheepe (to wit by preaching and miniſtring Sacraments) I am fedde. *Ep. ad Heliodorum*

25. Poſſiuine a Ieſuite out of diuers Fathers whom he citeth in the Margent, gathereth theſe differences betwixt the life and functions of Priests and Regulars: *Alij Monaſtica vita, alij vero Presbyterij fines, ac diuerſa penè vtrinſq; ſtatus olim officia extiterunt. Monachorum illa propria erant, ingis oratio, pſalmodia, vigiliæ, &c.* Others are the ends of *Poſſenin. to. 1. l. 5. c. 54.*

Monasticall life, others of Priesthood, and allmost diuerse in tymes past vvere the offices of both states. These vvere the proper offices of Monkes, continuall prayer, singing of psalmes, vvatchings, fasting, and other exercises, contemplation of diuine thinges, and euẽ the manner of liuing vvas distinct in diet, clothing place, from communicatiõ vvith other men, according to the Etymologie of the name. And Dionysius Areopagita vvhen he had constituted Monkes aboue the people, but vnder the Clergie, (yet vvho for puritie of life should approche nearest to Ecclesiasticall functions) and had described their life and state, he testifieth that by the Apostles they vvere called Therapeutes of the lavvfull vvorship and contemplation of God, to vvhich one thing, they vvholie dedicated themselues, and vvere called Monkes of the vndenided and singular or sole life (vvhich they professed) and separated from other thinges. Moreouer the vvhole rite and ceremonie of the Monasticall consecratiõ vvhich is to bee seen in S. Denys, doth designe this secretion and separation, and transformation, into a sole life and contemplation of God.

1.q.1. c. placuit. *There are extant of this thing many decrees of the Fathers in Gratian and Iuo. In the Councel of Nice vvee reade the 61. canõ of the Arabicks, that the conuersation of Monkes according to their name should be separated from the rest. In the Councell of Chalcedon cap. 4. the life of Monkes is defined by prayer, fasting, quietnes and clausure or shutting vp. And S. Hierome in his Epistles to*

Ripa-

Riparius, Paulinus, Heliodorus, Rusticus and desiderius teacheth, that solitarines, prayer vvithout intermission, vvatchings, labour of hands, contemplation of diuine thinges, and a penitent life, by the Apostolicall institution altogether separated from others, and according to the interpretation of the name sole or singular, is proper to them, that is to Monkes. In the same manner Chrysostomus also describeth the institute of Monkes: Domus luctus (inquit) sunt Monasteria, vbi cinis atq; cilicium, vbi solitudo, ieiunia, terrenorum duritia lectulorum, nulla ibi perturbationes, nulla cura, tranquillo nempe in portu nauigant, alta ibi quies & silentium: Monasteries (sayth hee) are the houses of mourning, vvhere is Ashes and haire cloth, vvhere is solitude, fasting, the hardenes of earthlie biddes, noe perturbations there, noe cares, for they sayle in a quiet hauen: there is great rest and silence. But (sayth Posseuine) these are the propter offices of Presbiters and Religious Priests of the institution of Christe, to imploy them selues for the saluation of men, as God his coadiutors, to edifie others by discipline of manners, doctrine of fayth, and ministerie of the vvord, administration of the Sacraments, exemplar life and prayer, to profit the people. To bee breefe (as by Dionysius it is deliuered) to purge illuminate and perfect others: vvhich are the proper actions of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie. Thus farre Posseuinus.

26. The maior then and minor proposi-

tion being proued, the conclusion doth follow in good consequence, to wit, that Regulars vvho haue so different a manner of liuing, from Bishops, Priests, and other Ministers of the Church (who by all mens confession, and by the aforesayd definition of the Councell of Trent, are of the Hierarchie) and vvho agree not with thē in any Hierarchiall actions and functions, which consiste in purging, illuminating and perfecting, by preaching and administration of Sacraments, are not of the Hierarchie in the sense and meaning, in which S. Denys and his Translatours and Interpreters doe take the name of Hierarchie, though they be by them placed aboue the laitie, next to the Clergie, and are of them, and all good Catholiques esteemed as worthie and eminent members of the Church ornaments and aydes vnto it.

27. By this all that *M. Nicholas* alleageth out of S. Denys him selfe and other Authours is answered; for that S. Denys will not be found contrarie to him selfe: and other Autours as *M. Nicholas* trulie confesseth n. 1. *Haue from him the best and almost only*, Treatises of the Hierarchie. But yet least he, or some for him, may imagin that I mentioned not his obiections, because I could not solue them, I shall set them down.

M. Ni-

M. NICHOLAS.

And first of all, it can not be denied but that the name of Hierarchie hath a latitude. For if it hath not; I demaund vvhether it signifyeth only order, or iurisdiction, &c. n. 3.

THE REPLY.

The Hierarchie comprehendeth both oder and iurisdiction.

28. To this he might haue found his answere in *M. Doctours* Hierarchie, in the 8. chapter n. 2. and 6. where he is told, that both order and iurisdiction doe make men of the Hierarchie. For if vve sprake of the Hierarchie (sayth *M. Doctour* n. 2. *as it importeth distinction of degrees in povver of order:* then only Bishops, Priests, and they who haue some order are of the Hierarchie, and they only in this sense are of the Hierarchie. And in this same sense, Bishops, Arch-Bishops, and Primates elected onlie but not in any order, are not of the Hierarchie; and so if they be not consecrated Bishops, they are not of the order of Bishops, if they be not consecrated Priests, they are not of the order of Priests. *But if vvee speake* (sayth M. Doctour) *of a Hierarchie as it importeth a distinction of degrees in povver of iurisdiction:* so Bishops, Archbishops, and Primates elected only and not consecrated, are of the Hierarchie, because by their election, when it is confirmed, they haue the iurisdiction of

Bishops, Archbishops and Primates. And so that *M. Nicholas* his *Dilemma*: *Either the name Hierarchie signifieth order only: and then Bishops, Archbishops, Primates Popes elected only are not of the Hierarchie. If iurisdiction only: Then Priests, Bishops, Deacons, &c. shall not be of the Hierarchie, till they be made Pastours.* This Dilemma is vayne and friuolous; for that the Hierarchie, as I sayd, so comprehendeth both, that order only will make a man of the Hierarchie as it importeth distinction in order, and iurisdiction onely will make him of the Hierarchie as it implyeth distinction in power of iurisdiction; and if he haue both, then by both titles he is of the Hierarchie.

To his other demaund n. 4. he is also answered in the Hierarchie chap. 5. n. 18. and 21. for if the fowre lesser orders be of the institution of the Church, as some Authours cited by *M. Doctour* affirme; then they who are vnder Subdeacons, are of the Hierarchie in regard of order, by the Churches lawe and institution, and not by the diuine lawe and institution: but if they be of the diuine institution, then these Ministers who are vnder Subdeacons, are of the Hierarchie in regard of order by the diuine institutiō. And seing that Regulars who are neither Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Subdeacons, nor Accolytes, &c. haue neither order nor iurisdiction

ouer

ouer the Church, as other Miniſters of the Hierarchie haue, they can not as Regulars, be of the Hierarchie. And therfore if an Abbot had only *primam Tonſuram*, *the firſt Tonſure*, which is no order although he haue iuriſdiction ouer his Monkes; Yet he ſhould not be of the Hierarchie of the Church, becauſe he hath neither order, nor Eccleſiaſticall iuriſdiction but only Regular. And ſo an Abbot as Abbot though he haue ordinarie power in his Religious order is not ſo much of the Hierarchie as a Bishop delegated: becauſe an Abbot not Bishop, Prieſt, &c. is not of the Hierarchie at all, but the delegated Bishop hath both order and iuriſdiction, and ſo by both wayes is of the Hierarchie. And therfore S. Denys as we haue ſeene, excludeth all Regulars from the Hierarchie, and yet ſome of them had iuriſdiction ouer other Monkes. Wherefore Regulars muſt not take this in euill parte, for I giue them as much as S. Denys and learned Regulars giue them, and would giue them alſo this dignitie to be of the gouerning and perfecting Hierarchie, if ether Chriſte or his Church had giuen it vnto them.

M. NICHOLAS.

That Religious Superiours as ſuch, bee of the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie S. Bernard cited by M. Doctour, *chap. 1. n. 17. doth expreſſely teache, &c. n. 5.*

THE

The Reply.

S. Bernard is explicated.

S. Bernard. l. 3. de consid. c. 4.

I answere that *S. Bernard* must be so explicated, as that he doe not contradict *S. Denys, from vvhom* (as *Mr Nicholas* in this truelie sayth q. 6. n. 1.) *vve haue the best and allmost onlie Treatises of the Hierarchie*, Certaine it is, that S. Denys, and his Translatours, and Interpreters, doe giue noe place to Regulars (amongest vvhom some vvere Abbots) in the Hierarchie, but doe place them vnder the Clergie and Hierarchie, and only aboue the laitie: and therfore perchance S. Bernard putteth Abbots amongest them that are of the Hierarchie, not because they are properlie of the Hierarchie, but because they are eminent mẽbers in the Churche and haue some resemblance by reason of their high ranke in their Religious orders, with those that are of the Hierarchie. And if I would take hold of euerie thing (as *M. Nicholas* vseth to doe) I could confirme this, because S. Bernard in that place, placeth Abbots after Priests. Or else S. Bernard rekeneth Abbots amongest them that are of the Hierarchie, because in his tyme most of thé were Priests, many had Episcopall authoritie in some things, and many were perchance then (as according to Bellarmine they are now) admitted by priuiledge or custome to haue their voice in generall Councels, and so by

S. Ber. l. 3. de consid. c. 4.

Bel. ta. 1. l. 1. de concil. c. 15.

the

the Eccleſiaſticall lawe were of the Hierarchie, as we ſhall hereafter in the end of this queſtion, declare.

31. Now wheras *M. Nicholas* in the ſame place ſayth, that he hath reaſon to complaine of *M. Doctours* dealing in alleaging S. Bernard, as if he *had ſayd that the Hierarchie of the Church is perturbed vvhen Abbots are ſubtracted from the Bishops iuriſdiction: vvheras S. Bernard in the verie ſame place, vvhich M. Doctour citeth, doth in expreſſe vvords approue the exemption of Abbots from Bishops, and only diſliketh exemption procured out of a ſpirit of diſobedience, pride and ambition*: wheras (I ſay) he ſayth he hath reaſon to complaine on *M. Doctour*, it will proue that *M. Doctour* hath reaſon to complaine on him, in making him ſay more then he doth, for doth not S. Bernard ſay as much as *M. Doctour* imputeth to him? Doth he not complaine in that chapter that the order of the Hierarchie, was then perturbed by exemptions? hath he not theſe complayning words? *Subtrahuntur Abbates Epiſcopis, Epiſcopi Archiepiſcopis, Archiepiſcopi Patriarchis ſeu Primatibus. Bona ne ſpecies haec? mirum ſi excuſari queat vel opus. Sic fac titando probatis vos habere plenitudinem poteſtatis; ſed iuſtitiæ forte non ita. Facitis hoc quia poteſtis, ſed vtrum & debeatis quæſtio eſt. Honorum ac dignitatum gradus & ordines quibuſq; ſuos, ſeruare poſſitis illis non inuidere.* Abbots are ſubtracted fror-

from Bishops, Bishops from Archbishops, Archbishops frō Patriarches or Primates. And these words only *M. Doctour* alleaged. But S. Bernard as we haue seen goeth on further. *Bona ne species hæc? Is this a good shovve? forsoothe if euē the vvorke it selfe can be excused by so doing. You* (he speaketh to Pope Eugenius) *proue that you haue the fulnes of powver, but perchance not so of iustice, you doe this because you can; but vvhether you should, there is a question.* Wherfore if S. Bernard in speaking thus much against exemptiōs (to wit which haue no lawfull cause) doth not deny but that the Pope hath power and iust cause to exempte Abbots and Monasteries from the iurisdiction of the Bishop; much lesse can *M. Nicholas* inferre against *M. Doctour*, who sayd not so much as he, that he is against all exemptions; but as S. Bernard for all those words doth allow of exemptions when there is iust cause (as when a Monasterie from the beginning hath been exempte) so might *M. Doctour*, and so he doth.

M. NICHOLAS.

Manclerus also, vvhom M. Doctour *in his* 10. *chapter n.* 23. *stileth a learned Doctour of Sorbon, comparcth Superiours in Religion to the Principalities; secular Pastours, inferiours to Bishops, to Archangels; and Priests not Curates to Angelles n.* 5.

THE

The Reply.

Manclerus meaneth only that Superiours in Religion haue some similitude with Principalities.

32. *M. Nicholas* now would place Superiours of Religion not only in the Hierarchie, but in one of the highſt rankes alſo, for that he ſayth *Manclerus*, compareth them to Principalities. And I alſo honour them not only for their Religious ſtate, but alſo for their dignitie in Religion: But if S. Denys as we haue ſeene excludeth all Regulars, (amongeſt whō were Abbots) from the Hierarchie, and placeth them vnder the Clergie and Hierarchie, and aboue the laytie, they cā not be of the Hierarchie, vnles they be Biſhops, Prieſts, &c. or haue ſome Eccleſiaſticall iuriſdiction, or by priuiledge be admitted to the Hierarchie, as we ſhall ſee in the end of this queſtion: and ſo as Abbots preciſelie they are not of the Hierarchie. I anſwere therfore firſt, that as I honour Manclerus for that his learned worke, and for the greate good fame, and report that goeth of him: ſo if he did hold againſt S. Denys, I ought te preferre S. Denys, as he him ſelfe would.

33. Secondlie I anſwere that Manclerus intended not in that place exactlie to declare who are properlie of the Hierarchie of the Church, but only to ſhew how ſome in the

Church

Church militant reſemble one order of the Hierarchie, ſome another, though they be not properlie of the Hierarchie, as S. Denys and the Councell of Trent doe take the name Hierarchie. So he ſayth, that holy Chriſtians who rapte with the loue of God, doe contemne the world, doe reſemble the Seraphins, as S. Gregorie alſo by him alleageth doth affirme, and yet *M. Nicholas* will not ſay that all holy women or lay men who are ſo rapt with the loue of God, are of the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie. And if for this reſemblance which they haue with Seraphins, they are of the Hierarchie of the Church militant, they ſhould be in the higheſt ranke of the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie, becauſe they reſemble the higheſt order of the Angelicall Hierarchie; and ſo ſhould haue an higher ranke then Bishops; and yet S. Denys excludeth all lay people frō the Hierarchie though neuer ſo holy and burning with the loue of God. And the reaſon of this is, becauſe it is not charitie or merit which maketh a man of the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie, but only order or iuriſdiction, or Eccleſiaſticall office and dignitie: and therfore an euill Bishop hath an high ranke in the Hierarchie and an holy layman is not of the Hierarchie. So *Manuel. 1. p. l. 5. c. 5. de Monarch.* *Manuelerus* ſayth, that good Princes, ſuch as *Theodoſius* and others were, doe reſemble the Celeſtiall powers, and yet Princes are reckened

ned amongeſt the laye people, which S. Denys, as we haue ſeene, excludeth from the gouerning and perfecting Hierarchie; for although they be lawfull gouernorus of the common wealth, yet they are noe Gouernours nor Superiours of the Church, but ſubiectes to her Paſtours, and eſpeciallie to her cheefe Paſtour. So he ſayth that compaſſionate and charitable perſons, are like to the Angelles, becauſe they haue care of pupilles, widowes, and the poore, as Angels haue of them who are committed to their cuſtodie: and yet laye Chriſtians though neuer ſo charitable, are not of the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie.

M. NICHOLAS.

S. Denys de Eccleſ. Hierarch. cap. 1. defineth a Hierarchie in this manner: Qui Hierarchiam dixit, omnium ſimul ſacrorum ordinum dixit diſpoſitionem: He that names a Hierarchie, names the diſpoſition or due ranking of all ſacred orders. What words are heere to exclude Religious men, &c. n. 6.

THE REPLY.

The definition of a Hierarchie is declared againſt M. Nicholas.

34. Heere *M. Nicholas* vrgeth vs with the definition of a Hierarchie, and argueth, as he thinketh, *à definitione ad definitum*, which is one of the beſt manners of arguing. For if from the definition of a Hierarchie Regu-

lars

lars are not excluded, they can not be excluded from the thing defined, that is from the Hierarchie. And then as making him ſelfe cocke ſure to be of the Hierarchie by this definition: he demandeth: *What vvords are heere to exclude Religious men? I ame ſure* (ſayth he) M. Doctour *knovveth vvell, that by ſacred orders, S. Denys, is farre from vnderſtanding, as ſome valearned perſons might imagin, holy orders of Prieſthood, Deacon, and Subdeacon. But by orders he vnderſtandeth profeſſions, inſtitutes, offices, degrees.* Thus he. And if you let him goe with this interpretation, all Regulars muſt be of the Hierarchie; though they be but lay brothers or ſiſters, and yet as we haue ſeene S. Denys excludeth them from the Hierarchie and Presbiterie, and placeth them vnder the Clergie and aboue the laytie. So that it should be ſtrange that S. Denys should define a Hierarchie in the sēſe in which *M. Nicholas* taketh him, and yet should exclude them from the Hierarchie: which were to groſſe a fault to be attributed to S. Denys; for that it were to comprehend them in the definition, and yet to exclude them frō the definitum, which were as groſſe a thing, as if a logician should grant one to be *animal rationale*, and yet deny him to be *homo, a man.*

34. I anſwere therfore firſt, that S. Denys hath not that definitiō of a Hierarchie which

M. Ni-

M. Nicholas alleageth: for he ſayth not, *that he that names a Hierarchie, names the diſpoſition of all ſacred orders*; nor hath he the word *ordinum*, *orders*, but onlie *ſacrorum ſacred thinges*, to ſignifie that the Hierarchie is that, in which is a diſpoſition of all ſacred functions and Hierarchicall actions. The Greeke Text hath theſe words: Cap. 1. ὡς γὰρ ἱεραρχίαν ὁ φήσας, ἁπάντων ὁμοῦ συλλήβδην ἔφη τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν διακόσμησιν· ὥστως ἱεράρχην ὁ λέγων, δηλοῖ τὸν ἔνθεόν τε καὶ θεῖον ἄνδρα, τὸν πάσης ἱερᾶς ἐπιστήμονα γνώσεως, ἐν ᾧ καθαρῶς ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον ἱεραρχία πᾶσα τελεῖται καὶ γινώσκεται: which words Perionius tranſlateth thus into latin: *Vt enim qui Hierarchiam dixit, omnium ſimul ſacrorum dixit deſcriptionem: ſic, qui Hierarcham dicit, is virum diuino numine afflatum diuinumq́, declarat, qui omni ſacra ſcientia ſit præditus, in quo omnis quæ eum attingit Hierarchia purè abſoluitur ac cognoſcitur:* And Frere Iean de S. François, whom I aboue alleaged, tranſlateth the ſame words into French thus: *Car ne plus ne moins, que celuy qui dict Hierarchie, comprend ſommairement l'ordre & diſpoſition de toutes les choſes ſainctes & ſacrees enſemble, &c.* And the English both of the greeke, latin and frenche is this: *For as he that nameth a Hierarchie, nameth a deſcription* (or an order or diſpoſition as the french tranſlation hath) *of all the holy thinges together: ſo he that nameth a Hierarch he declareth a man inſpired by the deuine powuer or maieſtie and a deuine man, vvho is moued* Lib. de Eccl. Hier. c. 1.

vvith all ſacred knowvledge, in vvhom all the Hierarchie vvhich perteineth to him is purelie compleate and finished. And ſo in none of theſe tranſlations is *ſacrorum ordinum ſacred orders*, but only *ſacrorum* holy thinges, that is ſacred and Hierarchicall actions which are performed by the Hierarchie: which (as S. Denys ſayth) are in generall to *purge, illuminate and perfect*, by preaching, adminiſtration of Sacraments and ſuch like ſacred functions. So that according to S. Denys as the Hierarchie is an order and diſpoſition of all the ſacred functions and actions, ſo a Hierarch which is a ſpirituall Prince, to wit the Biſhop, hath in him all ſacred orders and functions, and comprehendeth all power and functions, which are in inferiour miniſters: and ſo all the functiõs of the Hierarchie of the Church are compendiouſlie comprehended in him. And thus *Dionyſius Cartuſianus* doth expounde the former words ſaying: *Noſtra igitur Hierarchia, puta Eccleſiaſtica, dicitur & eſt continens omnium quæ iuxta eam ſunt ſacrorum, id eſt, continua eſt omnium ſacrorum ad ipſam ſpectantium, puta ſanctorum actuum & ſacramentorum: Our Hierarchie therfore, to vvit Eccleſiaſticall, is named and is conteining all ſacred or holy thinges vvhich are apperteining to it, that is, it is conteining all ſacred thinges belonging to it, to vvit holie actions and Sacramentes.* I grante that Petrus Lanſſelius of the Societie of Ieſus, in his tranſlation of S. Denys, hath the

Dion. Cart. art. 1.

words which *M. Nicholas* hath and as it is like tooke out of him for he translateth it thus: *Vt enim qui Hierarchiã dixit, omnium simul sacrorum ordinum dixit dispositionem: For as he that nameth a Hierarchie, nameth a disposition of all sacred orders* (in which worde *Orders M. Nicholas* would haue Religious orders and institutes comprehended) yet the same Authour in his notes vpon the first chapter of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie, cõfesseth that *Perionius* translateth these words of S. Denys as we haue shewed; and that other Authours rẽad *sacrorum*, *sacred things*, without *ordinum*, *orders*, but sayth he, *verto sacrorum ordinum*, I translate it *holy orders*, and yet giueth no reason sufficient, why he leaueth the texte which hath *sacrorum* only, and why he dissenteth from other Auctours.

35. Secondlie I answere, that although S. Denys had sayd, that the *Hierarchie is a disposition of all holy orders*, yet he could not haue vnderstood Religious orders, but only those orders and functions which pertaine to the perfecting illuminating and purging Hierarchie; because he who afterwards in his 5. and 6. chapter of his Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie in expresse termes excludeth Regulars, and consequentlie their Religious orders from the Hierarchie; would not haue defined a Hierarchie *a disposition or description of all holy orders, euen Religious*, for that so he

should haue contradicted him him ſelfe, and should haue denyed thē the definitū, in his 5. and 6. chap. to whō he had granted the definition, in his firſt chapter : that is should haue denyed thē to be of the Hierarchie, to whom agreed the definition of the Hierarchie. I know that ſome doe other wiſe tranſlate the alleaged place, and for *Hierarchia doe* put *Sacerdotium* : but yet ſo as their expoſition alſo excludeth Regulars from the Hierarchie.

Ambr. Cam.

M. NICHOLAS.

But vvhy should I ſeeke a better interpretour then S. Denys him ſelfe? vvho in his 6. chapter titulo Contemplatio, *doth expreſſely put Monkes to be one of the orders in the Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchie: and a litle after the beginning of the ſame chapter he plainelie ſayth: Summus eorum omnium qui initiantur & perficiuntur ordo, eſt ſanctorum Monachorum: The higheſt of theſe that are initiated and perfected, is the order of holy Monkes. Before you heard him ſay that a Hierarchie vvas a diſpoſition of holy orders, and novv all moſt vvord for vvord he ſayth, that Religiō is ordo ſanctorum Monachorum, the order of holy Monkes n. 6.*

THE REPLY.

M. Nicholas *by the afore ſayd vvords proueth him ſelfe not to be of the perfecting, illuminating and purging Hierarchie, but only, as lay*

peopl

people are, of the Hierarchie of the Church.

36. By this one may gather, that *M. Nicholas* either doth not vnderstand S. Denys, or else is driuen to his shiftes, and therfore is forced to make vse of euerie thing that hath but the least apparence; though indeed it be against him. For in that S. Denys sayth, that the order of Mōkes is the cheefe of those that are initiated, he plainelie excludeth them from the *purging, illuminating*, and *perfecting* Hierarchie, and placeth them vnder the Clergie, and amongest the people that haue noe gouernment, nor Ecclesiasticall, or Hierarchicall function, but are initiated, purged, illuminated and perfected with the people, yet so as they, by reason of their regular state, haue the cheefe place amongest them. So that Regulars are of the Hierarchie of the Churche, as the people is of the Kingdome, but they are not of that part of the Church which gouerneth, purgeth, illuminateth, and perfecteth by preaching and administration of Sacraments. And therfore *Dionysius Carthusianus* in his *Elucidation* of the 6. chapter of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie, as aboue wee haue seene, sayth, that S. Denys in the 5. chapter treated of the three orders of perfectors, that is Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and in the 6. chapter of the three orders of those who are prefected, amongest whom are Regulars;

and ſayth he, when he ſpeaketh of the perfecting orders, the name order is a name of dignitie, when he ſpeaketh of the orders that are perfected, the name order is a name of ſubiectiō. And againe (ſayth *Dion. Carthuſianus*) the higher order of theſe which yet are perfected (as S. Denys him ſelfe alſo ſayth in the ſixt chapter,) is the order of Mōkes who (ſayth Carthuſianus) are called *conſummatus ordo, a conſummate order*, that is *perfectus inter perficiendos, perfect amongeſt thoſe that are to be perfected*, nor in the order of theſe that perfect others: for in that order the firſt (as we haue ſeene) is the order of Biſhops, the ſecōd is the order of Prieſts, the third the order of Deacons, to whō other miniſters may be reduced: and after them S. Denys and the Bernardine aboue alleaged doe place the Regulars aboue the laye people, but vnder the Clergie. And ſo although the orders of Regulars, be orders of the Church and a great ornament to it, yet they are noe orders of the purging, illuminating, and perfecting Hierarchie, vnles they be Biſhops, Prieſts, &c. but are purged, illuminated, and perfected by it.

M. NICHOLAS.

Out of S. Thomas, it vvilbe no leſſe eaſie to proue that Religious men are of the Hierarchie. He therfore 1. p. *quaeſt.* 108. *art.* 1. *in corp. ſayth thus: Hierarchia eſt ſacer principatus. In nomine*

mine autem principatus, &c. A Hierarchie is an holy principalitie, by vvhich name of principalitie, tvvo thinges are vnderstood, namelie the Prince him selfe, and a multitude ordered vnder the Prince. Are not I prayen Religious men a multitude ordered vnder one Prince, the Vicar of Christ and S. Peters Successor? n. 7.

THE REPLY.

Regulars are a multitude ordered vnder the head of the Church, as the people of a Kingdome are ordered vnder the King, but not as they vvho governe and rule.

37. *M. Nickolas* sayth it wilbe as easie to proue out of S. Thomas that Regulars are of the Hierarchie, as it was to proue it out of S. Denys: and I beleeue him. But as it was impossible for him to proue it out of S. Denys, so is it as impossible for him to proue it out of S. Thomas, who taketh, all he hath almost of the Hierarchie, out of S. Denys, and will not, nay doth not in any wise contradict him. But sayth *M. Nicholas, Regulars are a multitude ordered vnder one Prince Christes vicar*: ergo they are of the Hierarchie. I answere that if this argmẽt were good, it would proue also that the degrees and orders of the laytie are of the Hierarchie, for that they also are a multitude ordered by the heade of the Church, and subordinate to him in matters of faith and Religion.

38. Secondlie I answere, that two wayes

one may be of the Hierarchie of the Churche, first as the people are of the Kingdome, that is as ſubiectes, and ſuch as are ruled: and ſo all Catholique Chriſtians are of the Hierarchie of the Church, and are a multitude ordered vnder one ſpirituall Prince, the Biſhop of Rome, S. Peters ſucceſſour. Seconlie, as the King and his Conſellors and Officers who beare rule in the Kingdome: and ſo only Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, Paſtours, and thoſe that vnder the cheefe Bishop gouerne the Church, and who purge (as S. Denys ſayth) illuminate, and perfect others by ruling, preaching, and adminiſtration of Sacraments, are of the Hierarchie: and in this ſenſe, Regulars as Regulars, or who are not Biſhops, Prieſts, &c. are not of the Hierarchie, as aboue is euidentlie ſhewed out of S. Denys and others. And this diſtinction *M. Doctour* hath in his Hierarchie, chap. 8. n. 1. where he hath theſe words, which if *M. Nicholas* had marked, he would not haue made this obiection: for there *M. Doctour* hath theſe words: *It followeth now that I breifely declare vvhich in particular are theſe orders, and vvhether all that are in dignitie in the Church be of the Hierarchie, not onlie as the laitie is, vvhich is of this Hierarchie, as the common people are of the Kingdome, but alſo as vvho beare office in the Churche.*

M. Ni-

M. Nicholas.

In his second article he (S. Thomas) demaunds, whether in one Hierarchie there be more orders (of Angels) and he answers that there are: Because it should not be an ordered, but a confused multitude, if in it there were not diuers orders, which diuersity of orders, is considered according to diuers offices and actes, as in one city there are diuers orders according to diuers actions: for there is one order of iudges, another of the fighting men, another of such as till the ground. Marke how S. Thomas doth hold that diuers functions and actes are sufficient for the distinctiō of Hierarchies, although they doe not alwayes, presuppose iurisdiction, &c. n. 7.

The Reply.

Not all actes and functions, but Hierarchicall which are purging, illuminating, and perfecting, make men of the Hierarchie: and there is a difference betwixt the Hierarchie of Angels, and of the Church militant.

39. *M. Nicholas* because he knoweth that Regulars not Bishops, Priests, &c. doe not exercice Hierarchicall actions, which are *purging, illuminating*, and *perfecting*, by preaching and administration of Sacraments; would fayne haue it granted vnto him, that all diuersitie of actes are sufficient to make mē of diuers orders of the Hierarchie. And this he proueth out of S. Thomas, by

two

two examples, the one is of the diuers orders of Angels, the other is of the diuers orders in a citie, as of iudges, ſoldiours, and thoſe that till the ground. But as concerning the Angels, it is true in S. Thomas his opinion, (who holdeth euerie one of them to be of diuers natures) that euerie one of them (ſauing the laſt and loweſt) is of the Hierarchie: becauſe euerie one purgeth, illuminateth, and perfecteth his inferiours. I ſay *ſauing the laſt*, becauſe the laſt and loweſt Angels is purged from ignorance, illuminated, and perfected, but purgeth, illuminateth or perfecteth no Angell, he being the loweſt, and ſo he in reſpect of the Superiour Angels is not of the Hierarchie, but only as the people is of the Kingdom, as afore is ſayd. Yet this loweſt Angell, doth exerciſe Hierarchicall actes in reſpect of men, to whom he is ſuperiour in nature, and who he can purge from ignorance, illuminate, and perfect. Yet all the loweſt orders (as S. Denys teacheth lib. Eccl. Hier. c. 5.) may reſpectiuelie be called orders initiated and perfected in reſpect of the higher Angels. But in the opinion of other diuines, who hold that all the Angels of the ſame order are of one nature and doe not differre in nature and function, but onlie indiuiduallie; and not *ſpecie*, but *numero*: (for which opinion Vaſquez citeth diuers diuines, and which diuers learned Ieſuites

1.p.q. 50. ar. 4.

Vaſq.1. p.diſp. 181.c. 2.

tes doe imbrace) all the lower orders are of the purging, illuminating and perfecting Hierarchie in respect of the lowest order, but all of the lowest order, are in respect of al the higher orders, as the people is of the Kingdome, because this last order, in this opinion, beareth no rule or office ouer any order of Angels, nor purgeth, illuminateth or perfecteth any Angell; yet in respect of men, this order exerciseth Hierarchicall actions of purging, illuminating, and perfecting. So that *M. Nicholas* may see, that there is a difference betwixt the Hierarchie of Angels and of men; for that in S. Thomas his opinion all the Angels as they are euerie one of distinct natures, doe exercise Hierarchicall actions ouer inferiour Angels, and only the last Angell is not of the purging, illuminating and perfecting Hierarchie, in respect of Angels, because he is purged, illuminated and perfected, of the superior Angell, but purgeth, illuminateth, and perfecteth no Angell, he being the last. And so according to this opinion, all the Angels are of the perfecting Hierarchie sauing only the lowest. But the Hierarchie of the Church militāt though it consist of diuers dignities, orders and offices, as vnder the Pope, Cardinalles, Patriarches, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacōs, &c. yet there are many of the same order and iurisdiction, as many Bishops are of the same

ſame order of Bishops, many Prieſts are of the ſame order of Prieshood. But Regulars as Regulars hauing no Hierarchicall action though they haue other Regular actions, are not of the ruling and perfecting Hierarchie.

40. Now as concerning *M. Nicholas* his other example of a Citie, in which are diuers orders, according to diuers actions, as the order of iudges, the order of ſoliders, the order of husbandmen and tillers of the ground: I anſwer that S. Thomas bringeth this example, to shew that there are diuers orders amongeſt the Angels, as there is in a well ordered Citie: but his intention was not to shewe that all the diuers orders in a Citie that haue diuers actions, are of that part of the Citie that ruleth, and directeth, as the ſuperiour Angelles illuminate and perfect the inferiour. For in the Citie ſome rule and gouerne as the Maior and Aldermē and iudges, but the orders of Taylors and showmakers, and other artificers, though they haue diuers actions and functions, yet they are not of that part of the Citie which ruleth but which is ruled. And ſo although Regulars haue diuers actiōs according to their diuers orders, yet theſe actions being not Hierarchicall, they are not ſufficient to make them of the ruling, purging, illuminating, and perfecting Hierarchie; but only they are of the Hierarchie, as the common people that beareth

reth no rule in the common wealth, is of the Kingdome, amongeſt which people not with ſtanding, there are may artes trades, and actions, which yet doe not make them rulers in the Kingdome.

41. And by this *M. Nicholas* is anſwered to all that he bringeth in the 8. number; for that all he there alleageth in commendation of Religious orders, proueth only, that Regulars are worthie and eminent members of the Church for their ſanctitie and perfection of life, but not that they are of the Hierarchie in that ſenſe as S. Denys taketh the Hierarchie, becauſe as Regulars they are not to gouerne the Church, nor to preache and miniſter Sacramẽts, but only as Bishops or Prieſts, if they be ſo. And *M. Nicholas* ſhould know that one may be a Saynt, yea and a deſigned and reſolued martyr, and yet not be of the Hierarchie in this ſenſe, as if he be a lay man, or a lay brother. And ſo it is not grace, nor merit, nor mortification, nor perfection which maketh a man of the Hierarchie, but order, and office, by which he exerciſeth Hierarchicall actions.

M. NICHOLAS.

In the ſayd queſtion art. 8. he (S. Thomas) demands vvhether men be aſſumed to the orders of Angels. And his reſolution is: that by grace men may merit ſo great glorie, that they may be made equall to Angels according to euerie degree

gree of Angels, &c. n. 9.

THE REPLY.

That men may be assumed to all orders of Angels in heauen in respect of glorie, doth not argue that in this life they vvere of the Hierarchie in the sense aforesayd.

42. I grante that men by grace and merit, may be assumed to the orders of Angels and to the lower or higher orders according as their grace and merit is greater or lesser. But what then? *If gratia consummata* (sayth he) *grace in his full perfection, can place men in the same orders vvith Angels in the celestiall Hierarchie, vve haue no reason to doubt, but that a profession and state of life, most powverfull for attaining perfection or grace and charity of this life, may suffice to place the Professours therof amõgst the cheefest orders of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie vvhich is framed to the similitude of that other in heauen.* Thus *M. Nicholas.* And if you admit of his argument, you must admitte all Regulars euen lay brothers (so they be perfect) to be in the Hierarchie of the Church, as high in ranke as Bishops: for Bishops are the cheefest orders. But first I answer that if his argumẽt were good it would conclude against S. Denys, who as we haue alleaged aboue, excludeth all Regulars, as such, from the Hierarchie, *though their states of life be neuer so powverfull for attaining of perfection or grase and charitie.* Secondly I answere that this argument

ment is so poore an one that I meruell *M. Nicholas* a diuine, should propose it. For that deuines know, that by grace men cannot merite to be indeed Angels or Archāgels, or Cherubins, or Seraphins, but only can merit as greate glorie as they haue: and because some saintes haue merited as great glorie as Angels, others as Archangels, others as Cherubins or Seraphins haue, therfore they are sayd to be assumed to the order of Angels, Archangels or other orders. And because it is not grace but the order, state and office of purging, illuminating, and perfecting, which maketh one of the Hierarchie: a Christian in this life may merite as great glorie, and attaine at length vnto as greate glorie as Cherubins and Seraphins haue, though he was not of any order of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie. And so it doth not follow, as *M. Nicholas* thoght, that because men by grace and merit doe attaine to the glorie of the orders of Angels, that therfore in this life they were of any order of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie, for that S. Benedict and S. Frauncis may by the greate charitie and grace they had heere, be assumpted to the glorie of the Seraphins, and yet heere they were not Priests. And a laye brother or sister, yea a poore shepheard who was in noe order of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie, but only was of the Hierarchie as the common people is

of the

of the Kingdome, that it was a member of the Church, which is a Hierarchie, but did beare noe office in it; may be assumpted in glorie to higher orders then many are, who here were Bishops, Patriarches yea Popes. Otherwise according to *M. Nicholas* his doctrine because S. Fraucis in this life was in a state powerfull for attaining of grace and perfection here by which he merited greater glorie then a Pope doth and for which peraduenture he is assumpted to the glorie of Seraphins, he must in this life haue had an higher ranke in the Hierarchie then the Pope had. But as I haue tould *M. Nicholas* it is not grace merit or perfection, that maketh a man of the perfecting Hierarchie, but Ecclesiasticall order, office or dignitie.

M. NICHOLAS.

What we haue laboured in proouing that Religious as such, truly, and properly are of the Hierarchie, hath not been so much in regard of our selues as out of dutie and gratitude to those pillars of Gods Church, those Counsellers and sole electours of Christs Vicar, &c.

THE REPLY.

M. Nicholas *hath in this laboured in vayne, and he vvrongeth* M. Doctour, *as though he excluded Cardinalles from the Hierarchie n.* 10. 43. *M. Nicholas* hath indeed laboured to proue that Regulars as such, are of the Hierarchie: but as it is euident by what I haue

haue layd out of S. Denys and other Authours, he hath not been able to proue it, and so he hath laboured in vaine. And wheras he sayth that he hath taken these paynes rather out of respect to those most eminent Prelates the Cardinals, then for respect to the state of Regulars: as he currieth fauour with the Cardinalles: so he wrongeth *M. Doctour*, in that he insinuateth that he excludeth them from the Hierarchie: wheras he in his tenth chapter of his Hierarchie hath a great and long commendation of them, their office and dignitie. And in his eight chapter, mouing the question, who in particuler are of the Hierarchie: he sayth n. 2. *that to the deciding of this controuersie: vve must distinguith tvvo vvayes by vvbich Christians may be of the Hierarchie. First then* (sayth he) if we speake of the Hierarchie as it importeth distinction of degrees in power of order, then onlie Bishops, Priests, Deacons, &c. are of the Hierarchie: And Cardinalls, Patriarches, Archbishops, &c. vnles they haue some order, are not, in this sense, of the Hierarchie, because their dignities are not orders, but dignities and iurisdictions. But if we speake (sayth he n. 6.) *of a Hierarchie, as it importeth a distinction of degrees in power of iurisdiction and dignitie, &c. in that respect there are diuers orders and degrees amongest Bishops, vvhich make also a kind of Hierarchie,*

&c. to vvit Patriarches or Primates, Archbishops and Bishops. And heretofore Patriarches vvere of the highest ranke of Bishops; and amongest them the Patriarches of Rome, Alexandria and *Antioche* and after wards of Constantinople, *had the precedence, after vvhom followed Archbishops and Bishops: but nowv Cardinalles, and euer since they vvere Counsellers to the Pope and his Electours, take place of all Patriarches and are in dignitie next to the Pope.* And so Cardinalles though they haue noe order (as most of them haue holy orders, yea many of them are Bishops) yet in this respect, to wit, as the Hierarchie consisteth, of *diuers degrees in povver of iurisdiction and dignitie*, (which is the second way by which *M. Doctour* sayd that men are of the Hierarchie) are of the Hierarchie and aboue Bishops, Archbishops and Patriarches, next to the Pope. Now whether this their dignitie of Cardinall be of the diuine lawe, as *Turrecremata* thinketh, or of the Ecclesiasticall law, I will not dispute, but referre the reader to *M. Doctours* téth chapter: certaine at least it is that the Pope could institute such a dignitie by which the Cardinall though not in orders, is Counseller to the Pope, Electour of him, hath his decisiue voice in a generall Councell, and taketh his precedence aboue all other Prelates and next vnto the Pope. And therfore Cardinall Bellarmine sayth, that if

we

we compare the iurisdiction which the Bishop hath ouer his owne proper Church with that which the Cardinall hath ouer his title then ordinarilie the Bishop hath the greater iurisdiction. But if we consider the gouernmẽt of the whole Church in which the Cardinall hath his parte, in that he is one of the Popes Counseller: then the Cardinall Priest or Deacõ only, is greater then the Bishop. The same learned Cardinall in another place: sayth that Bishops haue an ordinarie *right of discipline and suffrage in prouinciall and generall Councelles*, and by priuiledge and by custome Cardinalles and Abbots, and Generalles of orders, haûe the same right. And if by this custome or priuiledge graunted by the Church, Generalles of Religious orders, and Abbots be of the Hierarchie, I will not giane saye it: onlie I say with *M. Doctour* yea with S. Denys, S. Paules Scholler, that Regulars as Regulars, and Abbots as Abbots are not of the Hierarchie, and therfore were excluded by S. Denys; but if they bee now, it is by the Churches priuiledge or custome; which priuiledge and custome *M. Nicholas* shall neuer be able to shew for other Regulars.

To. 1. d. 2. de Cler. c. 16.

To. 2. l. 1. de Conc. c. 15.

44. And therfore wheras *M. Nicholas* n. 10. sayth that he hath laboured rather for Cardinalles then Regulars in labouring to proue Regulars to be of the Hierarchie: he

hath laboured in vayne, not hauing been able to proue Regulars as Regulars to be of the Hierarchie; and he doth wrong to those most eminent Prelates and Pillars of Gods Church, as though they could not be of the Hierarchie vnles Regulars also were: wheras Cardinalles by their dignitie and by the care which they haue in gouerning vnder the Pope the vniuersall Church, are assuredly of the Hierarchie as it consisteth of diuers degrees in power, of iurisdiction and dignitie, as *M. Doctour* sayd: they euen as Cardinalles (though not Priests) hauing the highest rāke and Ecclesiasticall dignitie and office in the externall courte of all the Prelates of the Church, wheras Regulars as Regulars beare noe rule nor office in the Churh, and so are not of the gouerning Hierarchie.

45. Thus I haue proued sufficientlie, that to be true which *M. Doctour* auerred; to wit, that Regulars as Regulars, are not of the ruling and perfecting Hierarchie: and this, by the testimonie of S. Denys, S. Paules Scholler, (of whom S. Thomas and all diuines haue learned that which they teache of the Hierarchie) as also by his Translatours and Expositours, yea and by theologicall arguments: and I haue answered clearlie all the arguments which *M. Nicholas* hath been able to alleage to the contrarie. And therfore I

fore I conclude, that Regulars as Regulars, though their inſtitutes and orders be moſt holy, and which adde much ayde and greate ſplendour to the Church, and though they be eminent members of the Church, yet they are not of the Hierarchie in that ſenſe as S. Denys and his Tranſlatours and Expoſitours, or as the Councell of Trent taketh the name Hierarchie.

46. But let not therfore either Prieſts or Bishops glorie (vnles it be in our lord) that they are of the Hierarchie; for that their charge encreaſeth with their dignitie, and their burden is the heauier, the greater their honour is: and if they liue not accordinglie, that dignitie will not ſuffice to their ſaluation: but rather it will ſerue to their greater damnation. For as their ranke and degree is higher in the Churche of God, ſo it is more expoſed to danger; and the higher they ſtād the more ſubiect they are to falling: and the lower and greater is their fall, if they fall: becauſe as S. Hierome ſayth: *Non eſt facile ſtare loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri: It is not eaſie to ſtand in the place of Paule, to hold the degree of Peter.* And let not Regulars be deiected or grieued in mynd, becauſe as Regulars they are not of the Hierarchie: let it ſuffice them that of later yeares they are alſo aſſumpted to the Clergie and Hierarchie, moſt of them being Prieſts and ſome Bishops: and

S. Denys l. Eccl. Hier. c. 5. & 6. Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 23 can. 6.

let it content them (as indeed it may both content and confort them) that their life is more ſecure and free from all occaſions of ſinne, and that they haue better meanes to dompte their paſſiõs, to curbe ſenſualitie, to mortifie their bodyes, to ſatisfie for ſinne, to attaine to perfection, and to gaine an higher degree in glorie, ſo that they vſe their meanes, fulfill their vowes, and obſerue their rules and orders.

THE SEAVENTH QVESTION.

VVhether by the precedent queſtions vvee haue ſufficient lie anſvvered M. Doctours *Treatiſe, for ſuch points as ether deſerued confutation, or required explication.*

M. NICHOLAS.

I muſt ingeniouſlie confeſſe that I haue not laboured to examine all, &c. n. 1.

THE REPLY.

YOv haue not left any one of *M. Doctours* propoſitions or aſſertions vnexamined; but you haue not refuted any one, as is euident by my Reply to the former queſtions. For neither haue you proued againſt *M. Doctour*, that wit-

without a particular Bishop there may be a particular Church : nor that euerie notable part of the Church (such as England, France or Spaine is) ought not by the diuine lawe to haue at leaſt one Bishop: nor that ſuch a countrie as England, Spaine or France is, can except againſt a Bishop for feare of perſecution though it should be increaſed by occaſion of the Bishops preſence: nor that Regulars are in an higher ſtate then Bishops; nay you haue not proued ſufficiently that Regulars are in an higher ſtate then inferiour Paſtours: nor that Religious as Religious are of the Hierarchie : nor haue you anſwered any one of *M. Doctours* arguments grounded in reaſon or authoritie of fathers or diuines by which he proued the former poſitions, as is euident by my Reply. And therfore this your laſt queſtion being principallie a recapitulation only of what you haue done, I might heere make an end, all you haue done, being iuſt nothing. But becauſe you could anſwere to nothing, diſproue nothing, refute nothing that was to the purpoſe, or to the points in cõtrouerſie, you carpe at by-ſpeaches which it litle skilled were they true or not; and therfore a reply to this your laſt queſtion might well by mee haue beene ſpared, yet leaſt you should think that euen in thoſe things I refuſed to encounter with you: I shal alſo breiflie giue

you

you your anſwer to them.

M. NICHOLAS.

His Epiſtle in vvords exhorts to charitie but how much in deeds he hath by vvriting this booke preiudiced charitie, &c. n. 2.

THE REPLY.

M. Doctour *hath not preiudiced charitie.*

2. I doe not know how *M. Doctour* hath preiudiced charitie by writing his booke; vnles to exhort to charitie be to preiudice charitie. For, of this I ame ſure, that in his Epiſtle dedicatorie he exhorteth and alleageth many motiues to charitie, as he doth alſo in diuers parts of his booke, and he hath not one tarte or bitter word in his booke againſt any ſtate, order or perſon, but he comendeth all, and yeeldeth as much to the Regular ſtate as *S. Thomas of Aquin*, Suarez and the leardneſt Regular Auctours doe. But to this he is anſwered in my Epiſtle to the Reader, and in my Reply to the firſt queſtion.

M. NICHOLAS.

The Church muſt be gouerned by the Clergie, I grant, but I neuer heard that it muſt be gouerned by the ſeculur Clergie, &c. n. 2.

THE REPLY.

This is a ſtrange ſpeeche and is anſwered aboue chap. 9.

3. It is to mee a ſtrange ſpeech and litle edifying, to ſay, *that he neuer heard that the*

Church

Church muſt be gouerned by the ſecular Clergie.
By what other Clergie then by the ſecular Clergie hath the Church hetherto for the moſt parte been gouerned, and by what other Clergie at this day is it ordinarilie gouerned, then by the ſecular Clergie? Hath not *M. Doctour* shewed and demonſtrated in his ninth chapter out of Scripture and Fathers, that Biſhops, Prieſts, and Paſtours, are by the diuine lawe to gouerne the Church and to preache and miniſter Sacramẽts? and hath he not shewed verie ſufficiently that the gouernement of the Church and preaching, and miniſtring of Sacraments doth not appertaine to Regulars as Regulars? yet as *M. Doctour* granteth in that 9. chapter n. 15. 16. 17. that Regulars may be, and often tymes are aſſumpted to be Biſhops, yea and Popes; and then, to them alſo appertaineth the gouernement of the Church, but not to them as Regulars, for to them in that conſideration, Monaſticall and Regular actions and functiõs appertaine, not Eccleſiaſticall.

And therfore S. Thomas cited by *M. Doctour* n. 17. pag. 255. ſayth, that a thing may be ſayd vnlawfull for one to doe, two wayes; firſt becauſe there is ſome thing in him repugnant to ſuch an action. So hee who is irregular, may not receiue holy orders; ſo a publique ſinner may not preach; ſo one in mortall ſinne may not receaue the Bleſſed Sacra-

S. Tho. 2. 2. q. 187. a. 1. in corp.

crament ; so a Priest in mortall sinne must not celebrate masse , nor absolue from sinnes. Secondlie it may be sayd to be vnlawfull for one to doe a thing, not becauſe ther is any thing repugnant in him , but becauſe there is ſomething wanting in him to doe it: ſo it is not lawfull for a Deacon to ſay maſſe becauſe he hath not the order of a Prieſt. And in this ſenſe (ſayth he) it is not lawfull for a Regular to preach and miniſter Sacramentes. Yet as a Deacon is capable of the order of Prieſthood , and then may ſaye maſſe ; ſo a Regular is capable of order and iuriſdiction , and then he may preach and miniſter Sacraments. But as you can not ſay abſolutelie that a Deacon may celebrate maſſe , becauſe he as Deacon wanteth the order of Prieſthood : ſo it can not be ſayd abſolutelie that Regulars are Gouernors of the Church , becauſe as Regulars , they want both order and iuriſdiction which iuriſdiction ordinarilie is not giuen to Regulars but to ſecular Prieſts ; and therfore, that ſpeech of *M. Nickolas, I neuer heard that the Church muſt be gouerned by the ſecular Clergie is verie harſhe.* For that to the ſecular Clergie ordinarilie this gouernment of the Church is giuen , and if to Regulars it be ſome tymes giuen, it is giuen as Suarez ſayth by *delegation* or *priuiledge* , not by ordinarie right; and in this, Regulars are acceſſorie not prin-

Suar. to. 1. l. 1. de rel. c. 18. n. 14.

principall as I haue aboue declared. And therfore Clement the fift calleth Regulars *Cooperatours.*

Supra q. 5. n. 41. & 42.

5. And ſo *M. Nicholas* in this his 2. number was to forward in carping at *M. Doctour* for applying to Regulars that word of S. Paule *Opitulations* : for although diuers vnderſtand that word of thoſe who lent their helping hand to the curing of the ſicke, &c. yet as S. Thomas by accommodation calleth Archdeacons, Opulatiõs, becauſe they helpe the Biſhop, and in his commentaires vpon the Epiſtles of S. Paule, ſayth that they bee called *Opitulationes qui opem ferunt maioribus Prælatis in regimine Eccleſiæ : Who helpe the greater Prelates in the gouernment of the Church*, as *Lyra* alſo doth : ſo *M. Doctour* might call Regulars *Opitulations*, becauſe they helpe Paſtours, and are as Clement the fifte ſayth, their *Cooperatours.*

Clem. Dudũ de ſep. 1. Cor. 12.

S. Th. 2. 2. q. 184. a. 6. ad 2

In 1. Cor. c. 12.

6. And therfore *M. Nicholas* who in this ſelfe ſame place, affirmeth ſo boldlie *that in England Regulars are noe more ordeined to helpe ſecular Prieſts, then they to helpe Regulars*, ſayth not trulie, for that Clement the V. calleth them *Cooperatours*; and the reaſon is becauſe their principall end is not to haue care of other mens ſoules but of their owne : and therfore, as we haue shewed out of S. Thomas, their ſtate is *ſtatus perfectionis acquirendæ non communicandæ alijs* : a ſtate of perfection to be ac-

S. Th. 2. 2. q. 184. a. 7. & q. 189. a. 2.

he acquired, not to be communicated to others: the ſtate of Biſhops and other Paſtours, is a ſtate of communicating perfectiō to others: and therfore if the charge of ſoules be giuen to them, it is *per accidens*, and doth not agree to them per ſe, as it doth to ſecular Paſtours; who haue the caracter and ground of iuriſdiction. And ſo it is not ſo connaturall to Regulars (though *M. Nicholas* affirmeth it pag. 512) as to ſecular Prieſts, to haue care of ſoules for that ſecular Prieſts by their caracter (ſo that iuriſdiction be added to it) are ordained to miniſter Sacraments, to preath, and to gouerne the Church, wheras the Regular order is not ſo ordained. And therfore Germanius ſayth, *that Monkes ſhould not haue care of ſoules but in caſe of neceſſitie vvhen there are not ſecular Prieſts to be gotten:* and Sotus *vvould not haue Regulars take care of ſoules*, but to attend to their own inſtitute. And Rodericus ſayth that the Franciſcans did ouer fly the *heauie burden of Curats*. And Gerſon ſayth: *Debent parochi Religioſos tanquam coadiutores miſſos à ſuperioribus, benigne ac benevole recipere, modo non obſtet rationabilis cauſa, vt ſi detractor, ſi colluſor, ſi corruptor, ſi ſeductor appareat, & parochianos in contemptum parochi adducat, &c.* *Paſtours ought gentlie to receiue Religious as coadiutours ſent from their ſuperiours, ſo that no reaſonable cauſe be to the contrarie, as if he be a detractour, one that vſeth colluſion, a corruptour, if he*

Germ. in pr. to 3. tit. 37. Sot. l. 9 de Iuſt. & iure q. 4. a. 3. in fine. Rod. to. 1. q. 35. ar. 5.

if he appeare to be a deceiuer, or do bring the parishioners to contemne their Pastour, &c.

Whence I gather that *M. Nicholas* is not so gratefull to the secular Clergie as might haue been expected, for that (as we haue seen aboue in my Preface to the secular and Regular Clergie) Cardinall Allen of famous and pious memorie, made sute to the Generall of the Societie of Iesus to send the first English Iesuites to England to helpe and ayde the Priests, who to the nũber of fowrescore were there labouring and endeauouring the conuersion of soules, before the first Iesuites were sent. And the Pope sent them, and the Clergie receiued them as Cooperatours. And therfore D. Pitse in his booke of the famous writers of England sayth, that the Clergie desired the Fathers of the Societie, *vt sese Cooperatores adiungerent: that they vvould adioine them selues as Cooperatours.* And yet now *M. Nicholas* will not acknowledge him selfe a Cooperatour and ayder, but sayth, *that in England Regulars are noe more ordained to helpe secular Priests, then they to helpe Regulars:* VVhich I suppose his brethren will not saye.

D. Pitse in Edm. Camp.

M. NICHOLAS.

In his fourth Chapter n. 2. he vvriteth: that an Ordinarie must haue others to succeed him in the same authoritie, vvithout any especiall grante, &c. Out of these vvords, it most euidentlie

dentlie followeth that my lord of Chalcedon, is no Ordinarie, because he hath no ſucceſſour in his authority vvithout an eſpeciall newv grante.

THE REPLY.

What ordinary M. Doctour *meaneth.*

8. *M. Doctour* ſpeaketh of an Ordinarie made by an ordinarie courſe and meanes; and it is moſt true, that ſuch an one hath others to ſucceed him in the ſame authoritie without any new ſpeciall grante, and therfore becauſe a Bishop is Ordinarie, when he dyeth or leaueth the place, another Bishop is to ſucceed, who in that he is elected and confirmed Bishop of ſuch a place, hath the power and iuriſdiction belonging to it, without any new eſpeciall grant. But *M. Doctour* denyeth not but that by an eſpeciall grāt, and by commiſſiō, the Pope may make my lord of Chalcedō Ordinarie of Englād. VVhether he hath or noe, I thought not to haue diſputed; but becauſe *M. Nicholas* not only in this, but alſo in other places ſtill accuſeth *M. Doctour*, as though he derogated to my lord of Chalcedon his ordinariship and carpeth at it as though it were moſt certaine that he is not Ordinarie: I will demand only of *M. Nicholas*, what it is that is wanting in my lord to make him ordinarie?

9. There wanted not power in the cauſe efficient or him that gaue him the power of an or-

an Ordinarie ouer all England; for that the Pope who hath *plenitudinem poteſtatis fulnes of powver* gaue him his authoritie. And Syluester ſayth: *Ordinariam iuriſdictionem dant quatuor. Primo, lex inanimata, vel Canon. 2. Lex animata: vt Papa vel Imperator. 3. Conſuetudo. 4. Vniuerſitas approbata, vt mercatorum, &c. & ſimiliter vniuerſitas facultatum artium vel legiſtarum: Fovvre dot giue ordinarie iuriſdiction. Firſt the dead lavve or Canon. 2. The liuing lavve: as the Pope or Emperour. 3. Cuſtome 4. An approued companie or communitie, as of merchants, &c. and likevviſe an vniverſitie or companie of the faculties of artes, or of lavviers.* Silu. verbo iuriſd.

VVherfore ſeing the Pope gaue my lord of Chalcedon his iuriſdiction, there was no wāt of power in him to make him Ordinarie. And ſeing that the Pope made him Paſtour of England, as his letters doe witneſſe, there wanted not *lex inanimata, the dead lavv* or canon, for that the law and canon giueth to him that is Paſtour, all power belonging to his Paſtourship.

10. *M. Nicholas* will ſaye, that he was made by delegatiō, and commiſſion, and ſo is only delegate, not Ordinarie. But although this may hinder him frō being made Ordinarie according to the ordinarie courſe, yet it hindreth him not from being made Ordinarie after an extraordinarie manner, that is, by delegation and commiſſion.

11. For

11. For first according to the receiued *Axiom* of lawiers, *Delegatus à Principe ad vniuersitatem causarum, est ordinarius: He that is delegated by the Prince,* (as my lord of Chalcedō was by the cheefe visible and spirituall Prince of the Church, the Pope) *to an vniuersitie of causes, is an Ordinarie.*

12. Secondlie a Commissarie Generall, who is made by commission, is (as Rodericus sayth) an ordinarie: and his reason is, because *eligitur à communitate, he is elected by a communitie.* VVhich Rodericus sayth is determined by a generall Chapter called *Pincianū* confirmed by Apostolicall authoritie. And againe he sayth that the *rule* which sayth that *a delegate cannot subdelegate, doth not hold in him vvho is delegated, ad vniuersitatem causarum, to an vniuersitie of causes.*

Rod. to. 1. q. 51. art. 3. Glos. in c. cum ab Eccl. Prælat. De Of. Ordin. Pan. in c. susp. de offic. del. n. 9. Innoc. in c. 11. & in c. ad hoc de off. Archi. Sylu. V. del. n. 1.

13. Thirdly the Popes legate is made by commission and delegation, and yet he is ordinarie, as Syluester teacheth. For, sayth he, *Legatus est is cui a Papa certa patria vel prouincia committitur gubernanda: A legate is he to vvhom by the Pope a certaine countrie or prouince is committed to be gouerned.* And this he proueth out of the Decretalles in the sixt booke, where Innocentius the fourth sayth, that Legates, to whom in certaine prouinces the office of a legate is committed, *are reputed ordinaries.*

Cap. leg. de of. leg. in sexto.

14. Fourthlie a Vicar Generall of the Bishop is Ordinarie, and yet he is made by commission, as *Germonius* affirmeth: and Sanchez, *Sanch. tom. 1. l. 3. de consensu claud. disp 29. qu. 1. concl. 1. & ad 2.* who affirmeth also that he is Ordinarie, proueth it because *the Bishop and his Vicar Generall haue one Tribunal.* And, sayth he, a vice gerent in a diuers Tribunal, is delegate, but in the same Tribunal he is Ordinarie, and may assist at marriage as an Ordinarie Pastour.

Lib. 1. Anim. c. 6.

15. If *M. Nicholas* obiect that my lord of Chalcedō is constituted *ad beneplacitum Papæ: at the pleasure of the Pope*; neither will that hinder his Ordinarishipp; for that a legate is constituted also *ad beneplacitum Papæ*, and yet, as we haue proued out of *Sylvester* and the Canon law, he is Ordinarie. And so it wilbe hard, fellowing the opinion of these Auctours (for I will say nothing of my selfe but referre the determination of this to Superiours) for *M. Nicholas* to exclude my lord of Chalcedon from being an Ordinarie by commission or delegation. If this anger *M. Nicholas*, let him blame himselfe for that I would not haue touched this point, if he had not prouoked me. In his fourth number he taxeth *M. Doctour* for alleaging S. Ambrose 1. Tim. 3. the booke being doubtfull. But *M. Doctour* hauing alleaged other proofes to proue that the Bishop hath an higher

higher ranke in the Church then the Prieſt, and writers vſing to alleage diuers bookes of Fathers which yet are doubted of by ſome: this *M. Nicholas* might haue ouerpaſſed.

M. NICHOLAS.

Here nu. 14. he teacheth, that Catholiques ought to contribute maintenance to my lord of Chalcedon n. 5.

THE REPLY.

This M. Nicholas *should not haue obiected.*

16. *M. Nicholas* maketh *M. Doctour* a beggar for my lord of Chalcedons maintenaunce, wherin he sheweth litle reſpect to my lord. *M. Doctour* only alleaged S. Paule, to proue that *Prieſts or Biſhops vvho rule vvell should be eſteemed vvorthie of double honour, that is, not only of the honour of cappe and knee, but alſo of honourable maintenaunce*: and therfore we ſee that Biſhops and Paſtours are by the Church honourably prouided for. 1. Ti. 5.

But *M. Nicholas* obiecteth that S. Thomas ſayth that *the people are not bound in iuſtice* (S. Thomas his words are, *ex debito iuris*) *to prouide for the expenſes of others beſides Ordinaries.* To which he is eaſily anſwered; for that S. Thomas ſuppoſeth that the people hath their ordinarie Paſtours, who receiue their ordinarie Tithes, and other renenewes; and then if any will voluntarilie preache vnto S. Th. 2. 2. 188. ar. 4 ad 5.

them, they are not bound to maintayne them; but when there are no ordinarie Paſtors, thē the people is bound to giue them competent maintenance, whether they be ordinaries or delegates, for as S. Paule ſayth: *Who euer playeth the ſoldior at his owne charges? who planteth a vine and eateth not of the fruite therof? who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milke of the flocke.* And as in the ſame place he ſayth: *If we haue ſowen vnto you ſpirituall thinges, is it a greate matter if we reape your carnall thinges?* and a litle after: *they that ſerue the Altar, participate with the Altar. So alſo our lord ordained for them that preach the Ghoſpell, to liue of the Ghoſpell.* And S. Thomas and other diuines affirme that by the lawe of nature the people is bound to giue in generall, neceſſaries to them that miniſter vnto them the thinges that pertaine to the worſhip of God and their ſaluation; as the ſame people is bound to miniſter neceſſaries to ſoldiers and Princes, that fight for them or haue care of their common wealth, though the determinate parte which diuines call *quota*, and which in the old lawe was the tenth parte, be of the poſitine lawe. And ſo the Catholiques in England are bound to giue competent meanes not onely to their Bishop but alſo to their Prieſts, though the Prieſts be not ordinarie Paſtors. To which I adde that in the opinion of the alleaged

S. Th. 2. 2. q. 87. a. 1.

Au-

Auctours, my lord of Chalcedon is an Ordinarie by commiſſion. VVhere as *M. Nicholas* n. 5. addeth, that, *except for the Sacrament of Confirmation, vvhich yet hath not been adminiſtred to many, and vvhich alſo may be cõmitted to a Prieſt, they finde not vvhat greater benefit lay Catholikes haue reaped by my lord Biſhop, then they may receiue from ſecular and regular Prieſts: that rather ſince my lords comming, ſome inconueniences haue happened, vvhich they vvill not eaſilie be perſvvaded, they are bound to buye vvith mony: that they cannot take much comfort to ſpare frõ their ovvne neceſſities ariſing from daylie preſſures) for the maintenance of Agents.* I leaue this to the conſideration of the iudicious and indifferent Reader; whether in this he ſpeaketh like a religious man, yea or a zealous Catholique. But for the like ſpeeche to this, he is a litle taken vp aboue pag. 123. n. 38.

18. But I meruayle that *M. Nicholas* ſhould exaggerate, as he doth n. 5. the charges to which the Biſhop and Clergie put the Catholiques of England for the *maintenance of their Agents in diuers places.* And many will think that *M. Nicholas* sheweth noe greate diſcretion or prudence, to complaine of the charges to which the Biſhop and Clergie put the Catholiques vnto; conſidering that *M. Nicholas* and his brethren haue and doe daylie put the Catholiques to farre

greater charges; as appeareth by the state-lie howſes, purchaſſes, and many other expenſes, which commeth from the Catholiques ſtates and purſes. But ſuch thinges ſhould not haue been mentioned, but that *M. Nicholas* giueth the iuſt occaſion.

19. To that which *M. Nicholas* addeth in this queſtiō concerning a particular Church without a particular Biſhop, and a notable part of the Church without a Biſhop, and of a perfect Chriſtian without Confirmation, and of the Fathers and diuines alleaged by *M. Doctour*, and of regulars ſtate of perfection, and of their being of the Hierarchie, and all ſuch pointes, he is anſwered fullie, as the reader will confeſſe if he reade my Reply to his former queſtions.

20. And ſo that which he ſayth n. 8. is litle to the purpoſe: becauſe *M. Doctour* in his eleuenth chapter of his Hierarchie, intended only to ſhew that charitie is the perfection of a Chriſtian life, in that it vniteth vs to our firſt efficiēt, and laſt end, God. That charitie vniteth vs to God *M. Doctour* proueth out of Scriptures, and alſo by the effect of all loue, which is to make two freinds one ſoule by affection in two bodyes, as (ſayth *M. Doctour*) S. Auguſtine confeſſed of him ſelfe and his freind; who, were he *Nebridius* of whom S. Auguſtine ſpake before in the third chapter, ſtiling him *chariſſimus meus amicus*,

amicus: my most deare freind, or another, it was all one to *M. Doctours* purpose, and so might by *M. Nicholas* haue been omitted, but that he, not able to answere to any maine point, is enforced to take hold of euerie trifle. The rest which *M. Nicholas* alleageth in this question is answered, or else is not worthie any answere. Only there resteth one thing which I shall examine in the next number.

M. NICHOLAS.

In this account (of Popes martyrs) M. Doctour *is much mistaken, for the 3. last Popes by him reckened, namely* Ioannes, Syluerius, *and* Martinus, *were long after Constantine, &c. qu. 7. n. 10.*

THE REPLY.

This errour is wrongfullie fathered on M. Doctour.

21. *M. Doctour* in his thirteenth chapter n. 5. to shew that in the greatest furie of persecution, it was the custome of the primatiue Church not to except against Bishops, as some now doe in England, but to consecrate Popes and Bishops (maugre all the threates and crueltie of the tyrants) therby to practise the gouernment of the Church instituted by Christe, to strengthē the Christiās by the grace of confirmatiō, and by their authoritie, presēce, example, and encouragement to put life into them: affirmeth that *from the cruell Tyrant Nero, to the clement Emperour Constan-*

time the greate there vvas scarse any Bishop of Rome, vvho vvas not a martyr, vvho at the leest suffered not greate persecution. Tvventie seuen of them are commonlie anouched for martyrs, to vvit Peter, Linus, Cletus, &c.

22. *M. Nicholas* becauſe he can not diſproue any one of *M. Doctours* poſitions, as I haue ſhewed euidentlie; impugneth by ſpeeches, which be they true or not, it skilleth not at all, for whether iuſt ſo many Popes were martyrs or moe, and whether before Conſtantine or after, it is not to the purpoſe, it being true that many Popes were martyrs, and that the creatiō of thē was not intermitted for feare of perſecutiō, as *M. Nich.* would haue the ſucceſſion of Biſhops in England to ceaſe for feare euen of an imaginarie or vncertayne perſecution. But let vs ſee how *M. Nicholas* cauilleth and imputeth to *M. Doctour* this errour in the number of the Popes martyrs, which indeed is none.

23. *M. Doctour* ſayd firſt that from Nero to Conſtantine there was ſcarſe any Biſhop of *Rome vvho vvas not a martyr, vvho at leaſt ſuffered not great perſequution.* And there *M. Doctour* maketh a full point. And thē he addeth: *Tvventie ſeuen of them* (that is of the Popes in generall) *are commonlie anouched for martyrs:* but he ſayth not that all the twentie ſeuen, which he reckeneth, liued before Cōſtantine, as *M. Nicholas* impoſeth. True it is

that

that in the margent there is this note, (27. *Popes martyrs before the tyme of Constātine.*) But *M. Doctour* after he had finished his booke, trusted others with the setting it forth, and did neither make the contents of the chapters, nor all the marginall notes, and so, that was put in by the errour of one who marked not the full point which I euen now specified, as neither *M. Nicholas* did or would not.

24. And that *M. Doctour* meāt not onlie those Popes who liued before Constantine, but the Popes in generall, of which he sayd 27. were martyrs; it may clearelie be gathered. For that *M. Doctour* was not ignorant (for who knoweth it not?) that there was diuersitie amongst Auctours concerning the number of Popes, who were martyrs; some reckening 27. some 33. some 35. some more, some lesse. But he, that he might be sure to speake within compas, contented him selfe with the lesser number according to *Bozius* his reckening, whom he cited in the margēt. *l.* 8. *c.* 3. And to the end that the number twentie seuē might not seeme a Catalogue of his own making, he put their names in a distinct caracter, and cited *Bozius* in the margent. VVhich *M. Nicholas* if he had dealt fayrelie, should haue mentioned or noted that therby the Reader might haue seene *M. Doctours* intention, and whether he had falsi-

falsified *Bozius* whom he cited.

25. Moreouer it well appeared that *M. Doctour* confined not him selfe (in setting downe that Catalogue of *Bozius*) to the Popes before Constantine, because in that Catalogue he left out *Hyginus* who succeded *Thelesphorus*, and in the next paragraphe or number which is the sixt, he putteth him in his place after *Thelesphorus*, whom all they who recite their Breuiarie, know to haue been a glorious martyr.

26 If *M. Doctour* had himselfe made a Catalogue of the Popes martyrs, yea and of those only before Constantines death, he would not haue sette downe 27. Popes only, as *Bozius* doth, but rather thirtie according to the Romã martyrologe, *Baronius* and others: which Popes (that the Reader may see at how small matters he cauilleth) I will sette downe. To wit: Petrus, Linus, Clemens, Cletus, Anacletus, Euaristus, Alexander, Xistus, Thelesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherius, Victor, Zepherinus, Callistus, Vrbanus, Pontianus, Antetus, Fabianus, Cornelius, Lucius, Stephanus, Xistus II. Fœlix, Eutichianus, Caius, Marcellinus, and Marcellus. And Rishton in his *Synopsis* with other Auctours numbreth three moe, to vvit. S. Dionysius vvho in the Register of Popes followeth Xistus the second, and Eusebius and Melchiades, vvho succeed Marcellus.

cellus. All vvhich thirtie, vvere before Constantines death ; yet theſe three laſt I vvill not enrolle in this Catalogue , there being not ſo great certaintie vvhether they vvere martyrs or noe, and therfore I vvill content my ſelfe vvith the former thirtie : vvheras *M. Doctour* contented him ſelfe vvith 27. Popes martyrs in generall, according to *Beza*, it being not to his purpoſe in that place to examin the number of Popes martyrs.

27. Thus I haue anſvvered to all *M. Nicholas* his queſtions; I haue made good all *M. Doctours* aſſertions and arguments grounded ether in reaſó or authoritie ; and I haue ſhewed that he hath not beé vnfortunate in alleaging Auctours as *M. Nicholas* to ofté affirmeth. I haue alſo diſproued *M. Nicholas* his aſſertions, refuted his reaſons , and anſwered to all his arguments , as the Reader will plainelie ſee. And this I haue doone, not to diſgrace *M. Nicholas*, nor his, or any approued order of the Church , nor in any ſorte to auerte any one from a Religious ſtate, which (as I ought to doe) I honour frō my hearte : but only to defend *M. Doctour*, and the truth by him deliuered. Rather I wish and Counſelle euerie one , to embrace that ſtate of life to which God ſhall call him, and in which he is perſwaded he may ſaue his owne ſoule, and promote the glorie of God. For that Chriſte to prouide for euerie man,

man, and to condescend to euerie ones liking, hath furnished his Church with diuers
Ps. 44. orders, and hath *cloathed her roūd aboute vvith varieties*, that euerie one may make choise of what he best liketh, and which he thinketh most sutable and proportionable to his own forces. And therfore he that fyndeth him selfe able to ouercome the tẽptations of the world, and with the grace of God hath confidẽce not onely to worke his owne saluatiõ but also the saluation of many others: let him if he like that state take vpon him an Apostolicall Priestlie course of life; Priests being to liue in the middest of the difficulties of the world by reasõ of their preaching, teaching and administring of the Sacramẽts: if he otherwise be weake, feeble and is hardlie able to passe through those temptations and allureméetes with the safetie of his owne soule: let him hasten to some religious course of life proportionable ro his force and liking, with the aduice of his Ghostlie Father and those that are sufficient by their wisdome and discretion to giue him counsell herein; and if he hath not those talents which are required in Priests, and that he can not brooke the austeritie of Religion, let him endeauour to serue God in the
2. Cor. 9. world: *Vnusquisq; prout destinauit in corde suo: euerie one* (as by God his grace and inspiration)

tion) *he hath determined in his heart*: and as he shall think moſt conducing to God his glo- rie, and his own ſaluation.

FINIS.



6 NO 63

A MEN

MYRROVR OF M. NICHOLAS SMITH'S, pretended Modestie.

IT could not be put into Heretickes hãds for their conuersiõ, vnlesse vve vvould haue them scãdalized, pag. 2. By it he giueth a great blovvve against charitie, pag. 2. His Deacutorie Epistle is full of verball exhortations to charitie, pag. 3. Iniurions to the Vicar of Christ, pag. 21. They deserue no answvere, pag. 28. They are against him selfe, pag. 181. They are licke vnto Beza, pag. 130. His argument is a doughtie one, pag. 16. Insufficient, pag. 199. VVeake, pag. 49. Directly against him selfe, pag. 17. 51. His forme of disputing seemeth the same vvhich Heretikes vse against Catholikes, as vttering contradictories and nonsense, pag. 25. He treateth of holy things vpon particular designes and humane respects, pag. 6. He proueth his conclusions against all Logicke, by principles more harsh, incredible, and vvorse then the conclusion, pag. 7.8. He serueth him selfe of

strang

ſtrang and vntovvard propoſitions, pag. 7. He muſt anſvvere his ovvne arguments & contradict him ſelfe, and taxe his Holineſſe, pag. 10. 26. 37. His aſſertion muſt vvrong the Sea Apoſtolicke; and can ſubſiſt on no better grovvnd, then by Heretickes is vvont to be obiected againſt the ſayed holy Sea, pag. 12. He is miſtaken in things for the true vnderſtanding of vvhich, is required no greater labour, then looking on the booke; nor deaper learning, then vnderſtanding latin, pag. 19. Is a thing that no diuine, but euen no man in his right iudgement can affirme, pag. 39. He citeth Suarez againſt all Grammer, pag. 53. He teacheth in effect vvith one breath to deſire a Biſhop and to diſobeye Biſhops, pag. 59 He contradicteth him ſelfe, and impugneth his ovvne reaſon, pag. 198. M. Nicholas taxeth him of vvant of good manners, pag. 4. of vvant of prudence, pag. 7. of not vſing faire dealing, pag. 80. of ſpeaking partially, pag 92. 126. 187.

By this ſcanding of the vvhole peece vvhich is entervvouen in enery leafe almoſt vvith the like ſtuffe: the iudicious and impartiall Reader, vvill (after he hath read this defence of M. Doctours Hierarchie) eaſilie gather, hovv litle he deſerued theſe aſperſions of M. Nicholas.

ERRATA.

Pag.	Lin.	Faults.	Corrected.
6	7	farre	fare
9	in mar.	Sess. 4. c. 21. & can. 3.	Sess. 23. c. 2. & can. 6.
20	17	full false	full of false
	26	my Reply	this my Reply
		my Reply	this my Reply
21	6	this	the
22	22	first	other
	30	constance	constancie
	31		l. 4.
24	in mar.	l. 9.	cap. 28.
	17	cap. 29.	& 35.
	19	c. 53.	Christian
201	21	Christianitiall	by vvater, and
204	30. 31.	and by vvater	careleſneſſe
205	18	careleſſeſſe	confirmed
208	22	baptized	c. 35.
218	6	c. 53.	vſed
222	30	vſe	vvent
228	17	vvant	thoſe
232	15	theſe	cate
235	8	can	ovve
250	17	vovv	it
251	15	is	fitneſſe
253	12	fiteſſe	Bishops
	25	Bishop	contradicteth
257	30	contradicted	religion
264	26	regious	gloriosum
265	22	glorious	doe
269	20	doth	regulars
	31	regulat	on
270	9	an	vvherefore
271	22	before	Prelates vve
272	5	Prelates. vve	quietneſſe
293	13	quiteſſe	ſtiled
	18	ſtilled	vvho
	22	hovv	Palladius
295	21	Palladias	11.
298	in mar.	1.	τελεσικην
338	6	τελεσικην	καθαιρομενην
	8	θαιρομενην	holie
	9	folie	θεωρητικην
	9	φεωρητικην	

6 NO 63

